

THE
Counterfeit Convert;
A
SCANDAL
TO
CHRISTIANITY,
AND

His unjustly opposing *Quakerism* to *Christianity* justly reprehended.



AND THE
True Christ, and Holy Scriptures

Confessed by the

QUAKERS.

In opposition to Two Scandalous Books falsely styled

- I. *Quakerism Unherring, and Christianity Reviving.*
- II. *Animadversions on G. Whitehead's Book, Innocency Triumphant.*

Obad. 3. *The Pride of thine Heart hath deceived thee.*

Rom. 1. 31. *Without natural Affection, Implacable, Unmerciful.*

L O N D O N :

Printed and Sold by T. Sowle, at the Crooked-Billet
in Holloway-Lane, Shoreditch, 1694.

117103

E
II
than
Pea
war
(th
mor
am
Con
Con
and

A N
EPISTLE
TO THE
Impartial READER.

I Do hereby sincerely and in good Conscience declare, that 'tis not for Controversy's sake, nor in love thereto; that I am so much engaged therein; a Peaceable and Amicable Conversation towards all Men, and their Quiet Behaviour, (though of different Perswasions) being far more desirable and acceptable to me: Nor am I the beginner of these Controversies or Contentions, being wholly defensive in my Concern therein; but for the living Truth and an Innocent Peoples sake, to remove
A 2 those

The Epistle.

those gross Aspersions which are cast upon both, chiefly by contentious Apostate Adversaries, which are of the most disingenuous and malicious, who are more skilful in Perverting and Aspersing, than Disputing; their Pamphlets being stuf with Reviling and Railery, not with Argument. And if I did not really believe a necessity laid upon me (in point of Conscience towards God, and love to his People,) to discover and oppose their foul Abuses, bitter Aspersions and gross Calumnies, they might rail on against my self and others, till wearied and out of Breath, and the Fire of their own Envy consume them. But the Controversie is not Personal only, but the Holy Truth is concerned, our Christian Faith and Religion is concerned, our Holy Profession is concerned: And these furious Adversaries will needs concern, (and would fain incense) the Civil Government with their invective Pamphlets against us, to render us as highly obnoxious to the same as they can. And therefore we have been the more under a necessity to detect, oppose and obviate their malicious Designs, that our Innocency may

The Epistle.

not unjustly lye under such Clouds of Infamy
and Scandals as they unjustly cast upon us.
As Fra. Bugg endeavoured to incense the
House of Commons, against the People
called Quakers, with a Malicious Pamphlet
(to interrupt our Endeavours for Relief of
the said People in the Case of Oaths,)
therein most falsely charging the said People
with Denying Jesus of Nazareth, Con-
tempt of Governours, Christ's Ministers
and Magistrates, Scripture, &c. Having
before in his late Book stiled New Rom.
Arraign'd, termed Twelve of us Perjured
Persons for our Negative Testimony a-
gainst his so charging the Quakers with De-
nying Jesus of Nazareth, &c. and there-
upon acting his Mock-Trial, forging our
answers, and Erecting the form of a Pil-
lory, and thereby scandalizing divers Citi-
zens (of good Repute and Credit,) as Per-
jured Persons, thereby affecting not only
their Christian, but Civil Reputations,
commanding the said People and their Mini-
sters, with these Characters, viz. New
Rome, Rome's Sister, the Papists their
brethren, and with following the Steps

The Epistle.

of the Jesuits; and withal, terming one of their Ministers, one of her chief Cardinals; (i. e. New Rome's,) and consequently this is no better than to render the said People Papists in a high degree. Now let the Impartial and Judicious judge: First, Whether his unjust Attempts herein, and his thus misrepresenting us, do not greatly tend to lessen and injure the Protestant Interest, and consequently, to gratifie the Papists. Secondly. And is not this a plain Contradiction to the Government, which has been pleased legally to recognize us as Dissenting Protestants. Thirdly, And what Ingenuity, Honesty or Prudence hath F. Bugg or his Abettors shewn, in thus representing a Body of Protestant Subjects, as New Rome, Papists? &c. What a New Rome under the English Protestant Government? Strange Reflection? Fourthly, And whether F. B's. thus contradicting the Government's recognizing us (by Law) as Dissenting Protestants (by his thus defaming us as New Rome, Rome's Sister, Papists Brethren, &c.) be not Seditious in the Nature and Tendency thereof, as tending to stir

Discon

The Epistle.

Discord and Strife amongst Protestant Subjects, and consequently to weaken the Interest of King and People? Let the Prudent and Impartial judge. Fifthly, F. B's. rendering our Declaration to the King and Parliament, (for the Divine Authority of the Holy Scripture, as inserted in the Act of Exemption) Deceitful on our part, and to serve a turn, in his New Rome Arraign'd, p. 40, 42. This is to go about to invalidate and destroy a principal Condition of our present Liberty: And is not this to Confront and Oppose the Governments acceptance of our said Declaration. All which, with many more misrepresentations and Calumnies against us in F. Bugg's Pamphlets, greatly bespeak his Deadly Malice, Revengeful and Unchristian Spirit, which we hope no Rational, Impartial or moderate Man, will Countenance or Encourage. To be sure such malicious Treatment, must needs be odious to all true Christians, and Merciful Men. And seeing I could not with all my late and earrest Endeavours, obtain a Meeting for a free and fair Debate with Fra. Bugg, (when lately

The Epistle.

in London) about the Controversie he has begun and published between us. I acquainted his Two Ministers, (viz. William Smithies of Cripplegate Parish, London, and Isaac Archer of Mildenhall in Suffolk, where he lives,) with these (and other) his Abuses and Misrepresentations aforesaid against us, to try if they would put a stop to his farther proceeding therein; shewing them by Letters wherein his Abuse and Calumnies against us, would affect them, (he having the Reputation of a Convert, and his writing against us, approbation among some of the Clergy, by his own Confession.) But his last Pamphlet being in the Press before my Letters to them, I suppose they had not opportunity to prevent or stop that. However it will concern them for the future, to stop his Malicious Attempts, otherwise I am perswaded his work will not be to their Credit or Reputation: But the more to the contrary, if they do not stop, and lay him aside, and provide better Tools to work withal, if minded fairly to Controvert Matters with us, or otherwise to let us live quietly, and on all hands to endeavour
for

The Epistle.

for Charity one towards another as much as we can.

And seeing F. B. has presumed to dedicate his last Pamphlet, stiled Quakerism Withering, to the Bishop of Gloucester, falsely charging the Teachers of the Quakers therein with Damnable Heresies, even Denying the Lord that bought them. And yet as one both uncertain and doubtful in his evil Attempts against us, proposes this Offer and Submission to the said Bishop in these Words, viz. I therefore do most humbly offer what I have wrote to your Lordship's perusal, and shall most willingly submit to your Censure, the Matters therein contained. And if for want of Judgment in the Matters controverted, I have wronged the Quakers, I shall most willingly retract and make them publick reparation.

Hereupon, I and another Friend, i. e. Samuel Waldenfield, lately took occasion to repair to the said Bishop of Gloucester, (having the reputation of a moderate Person,) and shewed him Fr. Bugg's said Pamphlet and Epistle dedicated to him, and this very
Passage

The Epistle.

Passage of his Submission, as not knowing but he had delivered it first in Manuscript to the Bishop, for his Perusal and Correction: Which when I enquired of him about, the Bishop answered, he had never seen it before, nor knew the Man. Whereupon I shewed him how preposterous it was for F. B. to expose his said Pamphlet in Print to general Judgment, before he had the Bishops Judgment about it, and how inconsistent with his said offer of his Book to his Perusal, and submitting to his Censure the Matters therein. How insincere F. B. was herein is obvious.

It seems he was resolved to traduce and asperse the Quakers in Print first, that the Bishop might not have the opportunity to prevent him therein: Though for a Pretext and Colour, he Complements the Bishop with his Conditional Submission to his Censure and Judgment, whether he had wronged the Quakers or not. Did not this tend to make the World believe he had the Bishops Privy or Approbation therein, or otherwise, that he would not have divulged what he had writ, because offered to the Bishops Perusal
and

The Epistle.

and Censure? who knew nothing of it until 'twas gone out into the World. What a Mockery and plain Abuse was this, (tending to make the Bishop suspected of giving Countenance thereto.) To whom we shewed also Bugg's other Book against us, stiled New Rome Arraign. with his Mock Trial and Condemnation of Perjury and Pillory against us, and the Occasion thereof; which Calumnies the Bishop disowned, and could not allow of such Treatment. And I thought meet to give this hint thereof, to do the Bishop so much Justice, that he might not be under the suspicion of giving Countenance to this our Implacable Adversary, in these his Calumnies and bitter Invectives against us. As I did in the Postscript of my late Answer, Innocency Triumphant. For Henry Goldwell, Justice of Peace, and late Member of Parliament, to whom F. B. dedicated his other Scandalous Book, (stiled New Rome Arraigned) without his Privy or Knowledge (as he confessed) and for which he also told some of us, he severely advertised F. Bagg, when he saw it in Print (with his Mock-Trial, Perjury and Pillory

The Epistle.

Pillory against us) being sensible it was a Reflection on his Reputation, to be rendred or suspected as the Patroniser or Countenancer of such Scandalous Pamphlets. And 'tis to be much more hoped, that the said Bishop will advertise F. B. for endeavouring to shelter himself under his Countenance or Reputation.

[In point of Civility, I thought meet to shew the said Bishop of Gloucester, this foregoing Passage, (relating to him about F. B's, Dedication) in Manuscript, before 'twas printed, because I had such occasion to make use of his Name in Print, that he might not be offended; which he was not, but took it well from us: Samuel Waldenfield being then also present with me.]

However, whatever we suffer, there is a just and all-seeing God, that will judge righteously, do rightly, and finally determine the Controversie between the Two Seeds, the Righteous and the Wicked. To Him the Righteous Judge of all, we commit our Innocent Cause.

Friendly Reader, my Concern in this Controversie, is designed only to vindicate Truth according to my understanding thereof, and

The Epistle.

to do particular Persons wronged, so much right (as to their Principle) as by referring to their own Explications; for where either their Words are perverted, or seem dubious in the manner of Expressions, their own more full and clear Demonstrations ought to be taken notice of, in point of Justice to them. And where the whole Body or People called Quakers, are wrongfully charged about their Principles from particular Persons, 'tis an absurd way of arguing, whether it be from any one's defective or dubious manner of Expressions, (or our Adversaries own perversions and misrepresentations.) And in that case, to manifest Truth, and to do the said People right as to their Principles, &c. I find it the plainest way to have recourse to their Concurrent Testimonies and Harmonies of their Writers and Books, to evince the truth of their Principles to others. And this Method which I do sincerely observe all Religious and Christian Societies will allow of, and not condemn a whole Body of Sober Religious People, or Christian Society, for any particular shortness in manner of Expressions; for that were very partial and unjust. And

The Preface.

*I doubt not but the Lord our God will stop
the Mouth of Iniquity that's open against us,
and clear our Innocency more and more, that
his Truth may prevail over Deceit and En-
vy, and the Upright in Heart shall see it,
and rejoyce in the Lord, and in the prospe-
rity of his blessed Truth, over his and their
Enemies.*

From a Servant of Christ

*London, the 3d. of the George Whitehead.
2d. Month, 1694,*

*Reader, Note, That the omission of the
Names of our present Opposers in the
Title is, 1. Because of the Contempt
brought upon them by their great En-
vy and outrage. 2. Left their Names
in the Title, should cause some to re-
fuse inspecting this Treatise.*

In

In opposition to the great Abuses, Misrepresentations of F. Bugg, and his Advocate Tho. Crisp against us, the following Testimony (which was lately delivered to the Parliament) is added.

WE whose Names are underwritten (being in Christian Society with the People commonly called *QUAKERS*,) Do in good Conscience Declare and Certifie all Persons concerned.

1. That we sincerely believe and Confess, That *Jesus* of *Nazareth*, who was born of the *Virgin Mary*, is the true *Messiah*, the very *Christ*, the Son of the Living God, to whom all his Prophets gave Witness. And we do highly value his Death, Sufferings, Works, Offices, and Merits for the Redemption and Salvation of Mankind, together with his Laws, Doctrine and Ministry.

2. That this very *Christ* of *God*, was and is the *Lamb* of *God* that takes away the Sins of the World, who was slain, was dead, and is alive, and lives for evermore, in his divine eternal Glory, Dominion and Power with the Father.

3. That

3. That the *HOLY Scriptures* of the Old and New Testament are of *divine Authority*, as being given by Inspiration from God.

4. And that *Magistracy* or Civil Government is God's Ordinance, the good ends thereof being for the Punishment of Evil-doers, and Praise of them that do well.

And we know of no other Doctrine or Principle preached, maintained, or ever received among (or by) us since we were a People, contrary to these before mentioned.

Signed in Behalf of the said People,

Thomas Lower,
William Crouch,
William Ingram,
William Meade,
William Macket,
Philip Ford,
Francis Camfield,
John Edge,
Thomas Hutson,
Charles Marshall,
Josiah Ellis,
Gilbert Latey,
Theodor Eccleston,
Joseph Wassef,
Thomas Cox,
John Bowater,

Benjamin Antrobus,
William Philips,
Edward Brook,
William Townsend,
John Hall,
George Oldner,
Thomas Barker,
Abraham Johnson,
Tho. Twinbarrow,
Michael Russel,
John Harwood,
John Danson,
John Stringfellow,
William Paul,
Fra. Etteridge,
Benj. Bealing.

T H E

THE
Counterfeit Convert,
A
SCANDAL
TO
CHRISTIANITY.

TO introduce the ensuing Reflections on *F. Bugg's* said Pamphlet, I think it expedient to give a brief Account of our late sincere and earnest Endeavours for a Meeting with him in *London*, fairly to debate the principal Matters in Controversie between him and the People called *Quakers*; in order whereunto, in our printed Sheet, Entituled *The Quakers Vindication against Fra. Bugg's Calumnies*: The following Offer and Proposal was made, viz.

B

" and

" And further seeing *Fra. Bugg* has shewn his
 " Hatred and Revenge against *George White-*
 " head, especially for discovering his *Self-Con-*
 " demnation and Malice, &c. I (the Person con-
 " cerned) freely offer, and am willing (with
 " with the Lord's Assistance) to make it plainly
 " appear, before any Six, Ten or Twelve
 " Competent Witnesses, who are moderate
 " Men of Sense and common Reason, that
 " *Fr. Bugg* has grossly and wickedly abused and
 " perverted Truth, and wronged the People
 " called *Quakers*, both in *Charge Citation* and
 " *Observation* in his said Pamphlet (which he
 " delivered to the Parliament.) And that in
 " his Book *New Rome Arigned*, he has forged
 " notorious Lies in other Mens Names to ri-
 " dicule, defame and scandalize divers Citizens
 " of *London*, and men of good Repute, con-
 " demning them also to the *Pillory as Perjured*
 " *Persons*, in his pretended Tryal in a way of
 " Judicature, unwarantably acted by himself,
 " assuming the Place of both Judge, Accuser,
 " Jury, Condemner and Executioner, with a
 " form of a *Pillory*, and *Effigies* in't, to repre-
 " sent the persons so grossly scandalized by him:
 " I say, for these Ends, I do profer, (God wil-
 " ling) to meet *Fr. Bugg* before Witnesses, at
 " any convenient Time and Place, within the
 " City of *London*, that the Persons so defamed
 " by him, may be present. To which Propo-
 " sal I subscribe———*George Whitehead.*

Hereunto

Hereunto *Fr. Bugg* gives an answer, with a new Charge, with Six Articles against the *Quakers*, and Six against *George Whitehead*, dated *Jan. 29th, 1693*; and he has printed what he saith is the *substance* of his said Answer, p. 5, but he has left out of his printed, what really is the *substance* thereof, in the very beginning of it, namely, *his acceptance of my printed Challenge*, being in Writing thus, *viz.*

George Whitehead.

“In answer to your faint Challenge, in your pretended Vindication to meet me in any place in *London*, the following Words he leaves out, *viz.* [*I do accept thereof, and am come to London, being Sixty Miles to meet you.*]

Observe here, how plainly and positively this his acceptance seems to be of my said Challenge, but how insincere evasive and shifting he was therein, his following indirect Terms shews insisting upon the *Choice of Eight moderate Ministers, giving me my Choice whether to chose the whole number out of the Episcopalians, Presbyterians, Independants or Baptists, or whether each of us one out of each.* And what was his Intent in proposing such a Choice? It was that the difference might be referred to such Ministers for them to Judge and Determine; as he confessed at *Jacob Franklings*, the First of the twelfth Month, 1693, in the Evening before

several Witnesses. I shewed how unreasonable it was for me to give away Matters of Faith and Conscience, to such Persons of different Perswasion; and how besides the terms of my Challenge for the Persons present to be *Witnesses* only of what passed, *i. e.* as to matter of Fact, and not to refer matters of Faith and Conscience to their Determination; asking Bugg if he would refer all the Matters in Difference to Anabaptist Ministers? (whereof *Sprinkling Infants* was one, as he well knew,) He answered, *he would*; as indeed his own Proposal would have obliged him, if I had chosen the whole number of Anabaptist Ministers. By this those of the Church of *England* Clergy, who have encouraged *Fr Bugg* in his Scribbling against the *Quakers*, may see what a *Convert* he is, and how little of Religion or Stability he is come to, in his offering to refer Matters thereof to the Judgment of Presbyterian, Independant, or Anabaptists Ministers, whereby he had been liable to turn Presbyterian, Independant or Anabaptist.

However, since *Fr. Bugg* so plainly had writ that *he accepted of my Challenge, and came to London Sixty Miles to meet me*, I closely pursued him by Letters, thereupon sending one Letter after another for some time, day by day, for a Meeting with him fairly to dispute Matters; and seeing him Dillatory, and protracting Time by his various Terms he had to make one after another, I appointed several Meetings

Meetings on purpose, and gave him timely notice thereof, as many are Witnesses to Six several Letters of mine sent him. And this thou *Fr. Bugg* knowest in thy own Conscience to be true ; and therefore mayest thou not be ashamed of thy sorry shifting and evading both my Challenge and thy own Acceptance thereof ; and yet in thy own Contradiction art driven to confess in these Words ; viz. *Thus far then we agreed as to matter of Debate ; I in my Sheet offered to produce every Book and Page quoted, before Ten or Twelve Impartial Men, and by G. W. offered to make it appear before any Six, Ten, or Twelve Moderate Men, that I had wronged them. So that nothing remained now, but my coming to London to joyn Issue with G. W, As in Page 3, of thy last Pamphlet stiled Quakerism Withering.*

But that Agreement thou made shift to evade by other Terms ; one while by urging for *Ministers* of divers Perswasions as before, to be Judges of the Matters in Controversie : Another while, for a pre-Engagement to a Conditional *Retraction* under Hand ; another while to leave the Matters in Controversie to the Decision of *Disinterested Persons*, (as thy Letters shew.) And not only so, but thou woulst have pre-ingaged our Friends, (whom thou hast scandalized with thy Mock Tryal and Pillory, as *Perjured Persons*, to *Retraction* and *Condemnation*, if proved False Witnesses. Another while thou woulst accept against *G. W's Twelve Witnesses*

B 3

being

being present at the Debate, unless when the Certificate came under Examination, or called in when any Matter depending thereupon, was under Consideration; as by thy Letters to me, which was contrary to my printed Challenge accepted by thee. "Thou knowest what Exceptions I made against "the inequality of these thy dilatory evasive "Terms, and against thy Arrogancy, in bringing thy self into Competition with a Body of "People, refusing therein to make any such unequal Bargain with thee, to gratifie thy Ambition. Whereupon I queried, *First*, Do any "of the Clergy engage either themselves or "the whole Clergy, to stand or fall by *Bugg* in "his Controversie against a whole People and "their Ministers. *Secondly*, Will any one or "Two of the Clergy, (who are Men of Repute) "personate and vindicate *Bugg* against the *Quakers*, as in my Letter to him dated the "Twelfth of the Twelfth Month, 1693. Now *F*, *Bugg* thou art still partial and unjust, in leaving out my Answers to thy Offers and Terms in thy said Printed Pamphlets thou hast left out.

First, Thy accepting my Printed Challenge, and coming Sixty Miles to *London* to meet me.

Secondly, My Proffer to leave thee to thy Liberty, to bring whom thou pleased of Members of Parliament, or Ministers for Witnesses.

Thirdly,

Thirdly, My Answers to thy Offers, with my Exceptions against the partiality of thy terms, why didst not print them ?

Fourthly: My Offers and Appointments of Three sundry Meetings, and thy absenting from Two of them ; and thy flying of about Terms at another of them, (*i. e.*) at *Josiah Ellis's*,) after thou hadst granted interchangably to discourse Articles.

Fifthly, Thy granting a Meeting before disinterested Persons, without retraction, and my Acceptance by Letters, containing what follows, *viz.* “ Our demand of Satisfaction, and “ positive challenge made to thee thereupon, “ for a fair and moderate Dispute within the “ City of *London*, before either Three, or Four, “ or Six, or Eight or Ten Competent Witnesses, “ being *Dis-interested Persons* : And withal, giving thee liberty to bring Two, Three or Four “ Persons to be thy Advocates or Assistants in “ the Discourse, who are Men of Civility and “ Sense, that we might have opportunity to “ vindicate our Christian and Civil Reputations from thy great Abuse and Scandal, affecting both, by thy defaming us as *Perjured Persons* in thy pretended *Tryal* and *Fillory*, “ &c. in thy *N. Rom. Arraign.* And to clear “ the People called *Quakers* from thy Calumnies “ in thy printed Sheet delivered to the Parliament, as particularly that of *Denying Jesus of Nazareth*, &c. As more largely appears in our Letter to thee, dated the

Nineteenth of the Twelfth Month, 1693. Pursuant to which, we then gave thee Notice, " That we intended (God willing) to meet in " the upper Room, at the *Bull and Mouth* " Meeting-House, within *Aldersgate, London,* " on the 22d of the same Month, about the 9th " Hour in the Morning where thou hadst notice to meet us. And where accordingly divers of us, whom thou hadst scandalized as aforesaid, did then and there meet together, with several moderate disinterested Persons for Witnesses; and also then and there we waited for thee Two Hours, (or above) but thou camest not, as the Persons here named are Witnesses.

<i>Gilbert Latey,</i>	<i>Samuel Waldenfield.</i>
<i>Theodor. Eccleston,</i>	<i>John Butcher,</i>
<i>Richard Needham,</i>	<i>John Vaughton,</i>
<i>James Parke,</i>	<i>Benjamin Antrobus, and</i>
<i>William Robinson,</i>	<i>others.</i>

So that thy Evasion and timorous sculking to secure thy self from fair disquisition of Matters, was notorious, and thou wast as well told of it home, by my next Letter to thee, dated the 23d of the 12th Month, 1693. And how apparent therein didst thou act, contrary to thy own pretence of *accepting my Challenge, and coming Sixty Miles to London, and waiting near Three Weeks for a Meeting with me.* All thy slim Shifts, Boasting, Railing and Scandalizing us, will not

not cover thy *Shame, Guilt* and *Cowardice* which thou hast unjustly charged us withal, until 'tis directly fallen upon thy self; though thou falsely turnest the Story of the *Pursuit* against me, viz. *But still I pursued him*, (sayst thou, p. 7.) as if I had fled, when thou knowest the contrary how frequently I followed thee with Letters pursuant to my printed Challenge in the *Quakers Vindication*, seeing thou hadst accepted thereof (in pretence.) And therefore thy implying *G.W. to have shuffled and evaded a fair Debate*, p. 9. is notoriously false, as many can testifie, but true upon thy self: And as false is thy following Reflection; viz. *That G. W. promised in Print*; (and what?) *to leave the Matter to any moderate Men*. What I offered in Print is obvious; 'twas for Moderate Men to be *Witnesses*, as in the said *Q. Vind.* but not to leave the Matters in Controversie to them as Judges to determine. Wherefore I was not free to pre-engage to leave or refer Matters of Faith and Conscience to the judgment and determination of Persons of other Perswasions; thereby to betray my Christian Liberty, and come under an Implicite Faith, which my Adversaries Terms would have imposed upon me; though as I told him, I left others Judgments free, as I would have mine, without being preingaged or imposed upon. This was the general Reason of my not obliging my self to his Terms of others Decision.

On our deeming thee *F. B. a Self-condemned Apostate*, p. 10. Thou questions, *Is not throwing Dirt in the Face of the Government, rendering their Religion so false and erroneous, as that whoever forsake you, and conform to the Established Religion, must therefore be Self-Condemed Apostates?* As if the Government and Established Religion, must patronize and excuse all the Uncharitableness, Malicious Attempts, Errors, Lies, Calumnies and Enormities, under pretence of thy conforming thereunto. But here thou art out egregiously, thy Self-Condemnation, and Temporising, is made obvious from thy own Confession, *to the truth of our Doctrine, Ministry, Society, Christian Love, and our Meetings as Blessed of God, even with the comfortable Enjoyment of his Presence, as in thy Quak. Detect. since thy Conformity.* Therefore thou argues falaciously as well as maliciously, to render our deeming thee a *Self-Condemed Apostate*, *throwing Dirt in the face of the Government, &c.* This will not cover nor excuse thee before the Great Judge of all; thy Excuse herein being both irreligious and uncertain. And thence 'tis apparent thou didst not in 1686, account the Quakers *Criminal* in point of Doctrine, seeing thou wast *Confirmed*, their Doctrine and Ministry was a dispensation of the Love of God sent as a Visitation to Mankind as in thy said *Qr. Detect.* which many of the Conformists were never so Perswaded nor Confirmed, neither ever turned to be such Malicious, Inveterate Enemies

mies and Persecutors as thou art. Therefore Self-Condemed Apostacy, cannot be so justly charged upon them as upon thee. Thy turning thy Testimony for the Quakers Doctrine and Ministry, as by thee given in 1686, unto *what thou thought of them in 58 and 60*, is a most base and false Prevarication, as well as contrary to the plain Grammatical import of thy own Testimony given in 1686, (Two Years after thy leaving us, and conforming to the Church of England,) which thou confirmest in these positive Expressions, as thy then present Sense, viz.

“ And in this Manner we went on for many
 “ Years, and loved one another with Love un-
 “ feigned. And doubtless God blessed our Meet-
 “ ings with the comfortable Enjoyment of his
 “ Presence.

Thus thou in 1686 : How canst thou in Conscience alter and turn this to *what thou thought of us in 58 and 60* ? Oh Hardned Man, and injurious to thy own Conscience ; awake, awake to judgment !

Thy consequence also is very inconsequent and false, *That by our Doctrine, Pious Sincere Christians are rendred Apostates for acknowledging themselves mistaken (upon Conviction) in that they once thought the Popish Doctrine true, &c. Quak. Wither, p. 12.* For the First, Thou art no such Pious sincere Christian as left us, and conformed upon any such Conviction. Secondly, Thou wast not convicted that our Doctrine and Ministry

Ministry were false or erroneous, when thou left us, nor when after thy Conformity thou confests'd it *was a Dispensation of the love of God, and God blessed our Meetings, &c.*

Thy First Charge against the Quakers is, *That they deny Jesus of Nazareth, who was born of the blessed Virgin Mary to be Christ, and the efficient Cause of Mans Salvation.*

Here are Two Charges made one, both which we positively and sincerely deny, as contrary to our profess'd and known Principles. The

* 1 *Joh.* 1. 14. *Luk.* 1. 26. & 2. 10. 1. *Mark* 9. 7. *Mat.* 17. 5. & 26. 67. & 27. 38. 50. & 28. 6. *Akts* 1. 9, 10, 11. & 5. 30, 31. *Akts* 2. 36. *Hebr.* 5. 9. & 12. 2. *Rom.* 8. 34. *Akts* 7. 35. 56. & 10. 38. 1 *Cor.* 15. 15.

Scripture Texts * proving Jesus to be the Christ, &c. p. 14, 15, 16. we ever have and do sincerely believe and own. But that the Quakers teach the contrary, (as Bugg saith) we utterly deny, as a gross Calumny

imposed upon us. His instance for proof from *Isaac Pennington's Question to Professors*, wherein he distinguishes between Christ and the Body in which he came, and between the outward Vessel and the Inward Life, and not calling the Bodily Garment Christ, &c. i. e. chiefly and in the first place Christ, as *I. P.* explains himself, is no Proof that the Quakers deny Jesus to be Christ, for he did not consist only of an outward Body or Vessel, he had both inward Life, Soul and Spirit, even as perfect
Man,

Man, much more as *God*. And therefore *Fr. Bugg's* inference, that the Quakers would divide the Humanity from the Godhead is false ; they are distinguished but not divided in the entire Being of Christ ; as also that *they can never call him Christ but a Vail*, is falsely insinuated ; though his *Flesh* was called the *Vail*, Heb. 10. 20. This Objection has been plainly answered as well as the Question: *Doth not the Name Christ belong to the whole Body*, &c. In our *Charitable Essay*, p. 4. which *Fr. Bugg* gives the go by to, without Replication, running the rounds to his old Objection, *Idem per Idem*, imposing and begging the Question ; he will neither see, nor take Answers, how plainly soever given, thus impertinent and trifling he is.

But to clear *Isaac Pennington* in this Point, he did not deny *Jesus of Nazareth* to be Christ, but sincerely confesseth to the same *Jesus Christ* in his Works, 2d Part, p. 18. in these Words, viz. " The *Enemy* hath raised up Jealousies and " Prejudices against us, as if we denied the " Scriptures and Ordinances of God, and that " *Christ* that died at *Jerusalem* ; against which " *Isaac P.* Answers, viz. First, That we do really in our Hearts own that Christ who came in " the fulness of time in that prepared Body to do the Father's Will, (His coming " into the World, Doctrine, Miracles, Sufferings, Death, Resurrection, &c. in plainness and simplicity of Heart, according

" as it is exprest in the Letters of the Scripture,
 " Secondly, That we own no other Christ than
 " *that*, nor hold forth no other thing for *Christ*
 " but *him*, who then appeared and was made
 " manifest in the Flesh. And p. 19. *ibid.* The
 " Lord hath shewn me in Spirit, that they them-
 " selves are guilty of that very charge, (and
 " that he will so implead them at his Judgment
 " Seat) which they cast upon us, even of deny-
 " ing that Christ which died at *Jerusalem* to be
 " Christ. Thus far *Isaac Pennington*. What
 more plain and innocent Testimony could Man
 have given? Where's now either his or the
 Quakers denial of Jesus of *Nazareth* to be *Christ*,
 as *F. Bugg* has over and over unjustly charged
 us.

Another Instance out of the *Christian Quaker*,
 " is that *the holy Body*, (*i. e.* of Christ,) was not
 " instrumentally, without a share of the gene-
 " ral Victory, and holy Priviledges obtained;
 " yet that the efficient and chiefeft Cause was
 " the Light and Life, p. 18.

This is so far from either denying Jesus to be
 Christ, or the efficient Cause of Salvation, that
 it is a plain Confession that Jesus Christ was
 both the instrumental, and the efficient cause
 of Man's Salvation; *Instrumental* in his Holy
 Body, and *Efficient* by his Light and Life: See-
 ing we preach no other Light or Life to effect
 Salvation, but that of Jesus Christ. And we
 know of no true Understanding Christians, but
 will confess that it was not the Humanity or
 Man-

Manhood of Christ *only* that effects or works Man's Salvation, without the *Divinity*, seeing as *Man*, he saith, *I can of my Self do nothing; as I hear I judge*, John 5. 30.

Wherefore Fr. Bugg's Inference, that they, (i. e.) the Quakers,) *have robbed the blessed Jesus of one of his eminent Attributes, (viz. of being the efficient Cause of Man's Salvation,)* is notoriously false and impertinent like the rest, (Jesus Christ is a compleat Saviour.) As also is F. B's other, *That they insinuate by consequence that Him that was born of the Virgin, He is no otherwise a Saviour, than other good Men are*, p. 21.

Which he has flatly contradicted by his Instance immediately following, viz. *If some Men in Scriptures are entituled Saviours, because of their Contribution of their Trials, Travels and Labours towards the Salvation of Mankind; of much more right is that honour ascribed to Him who had the Spirit without Measure, &c.* p. 21.

Whereby its apparent, that much more Honour of a Saviour is ascribed to Christ, than to any other Men. Thus notorious is Bugg in his Contradiction to himself, most unjustly to prove his Lying Charge of *their Denying Jesus to be the Christ, and the efficient Cause of Man's Salvation. Oh Horrible Insolency, and Self-Condemed Apostacy!*

Now Fr. Bugg, I query of thee,

1. Didst thou, when a Quaker, deny Jesus to be the Christ.

2. Didst

2. Didst thou when a Quaker, deny Jesus to be the efficient cause of Man's Salvation ?

3. Didst thou when a Quaker, ever hear the Quakers deny Jesus to be the Christ in their Ministry.

4. Didst thou when a Quaker ever hear the Quakers Deny Christ to be the efficient Cause of Man's Salvation ?

5. Nay, didst thou deny Jesus to be the Christ, or the efficient Cause of Man's Salvation, when in the Name of the People called Quakers, thou confessedst, *That in the beginning the inshining Light of Christ Jesus by his Heavenly Spiritual Appearance in the Hearts and Souls of his People, was our Principle, the very Foundation, Principle and Corner Stone of our Building?* See his *De Christ. Lib. 2d Part, p. 24.*

6. Didst thou deny Jesus Christ to be the efficient Cause of Man's Salvation, in thy confessing to *this inshining Light of Christ Jesus, as the more sure word of Prophecie; and that there was sufficiency in it, (being obeyed) to lead to Salvation?* Or in thy confessing to *the vertue and excellency of this holy Unction, and to this word nigh in the Heart; and to Christ Jesus the Second Adam, as he is a quickening Spirit, even to Christ within; and thus People must wait to know him, except they were Reprobates?* *ibid. p. 25, 26, 27.*

7. Didst thou by these Confessions, deny Jesus of Nazareth, who was born of the Virgin Mary, to be the efficient Cause of Man's Salvation ?

8. What

8. What notorious and gross Contradiction to thy self is it then for thee, to make ascribing the Salvation chiefly to the holy *Light of Life* in Christ, and unto his Body *instrumentally*, to be a denial of his being the efficient cause of Man's Salvation, *Qu. Wither.* p. 22. Seeing that *Light of Life* was the *Light and Life of the same Jesus Christ*.

And I think it is a real owning Jesus Christ, who was born of the Virgin *Mary*, to be the efficient Cause of Man's Salvation, to confess that to his own holy Divine *Light of Life*, Salvation is chiefly ascribed; but *Instrumentally* to his Body. And hath not the Apostle *Paul* the like Distinction, where he confesseth *we were reconciled to God by the Death of his Son; much more being reconciled, we shall be saved by his Life?* Rom. 5. 10.

Here's *Reconciliation* by his Death, and much more *Salvation* by his Life.

Wherefore *F. Bugg's* Consequence against us, as bringing in *Damnable Heresies, Denying the Lord Jesus Christ to be a compleat Saviour*, p. 23. is a most foul and absurd Slander.

His instance in p. 23, that the Serpent is a Spirit, and therefore that promised Seed which bruisseth his Head, must be Spiritual: And that Seed is Christ. To which I add consequently, not only the outward Body or Flesh which he took upon him.

I cannot understand how this can be a Denial; that *Jesus Christ himself is the efficient Cause*

of *Man's Salvation*, unless *F. Bugg* doth think that Christ was made up only of that outward Body of Flesh, without any Divine Principle of Light and Life in him; which I suppose he will not attempt to own or prove. For though Christ took upon him the Seed of *Abraham* according to the Flesh, and was the Seed of the Woman that bruises the Serpents Head, even the promised Seed, who through Death was to bruise under, and destroy him that had the power of Death, viz. The Devil, yet he effectually doth it by his Divine Power, Light and Life, as the immediate and efficient Cause of Man's Salvation: Wherein we still confess his Sufferings and Death in the Flesh *Instrumentally* to Contribute thereunto. Christ Jesus as the promised Seed, who came of a Woman made under the Law, bruised the Serpent's Head, both without us and within us; *without us*, through his Sufferings and Death, (by his Divine Testimony, Word and Power; *within us*, by his Divine Life, Light, Word, (or Seed,) Spirit and Power, which is all but one Christ himself, not Two Christs, nor to be divided. Else how could we be born again of incorruptible Seed? Or how doth that Seed remain in him that's born again? And is not that Seed Christ? And is not the Word of Faith, Christ in Spirit? 'Tis well that *F. B.* grants the head of the Serpent in Men shall be bruised. Consequently this must be for their Salvation. And Christ therefore as inwardly revealed by his Spirit

Spirit and Power the efficient Cause thereof.

Divers other absurd Consequences he draws upon us in this case not worth tracing. His other Instances to prove his false Charge of the *Quakers denying Jesus to be Christ, and efficient Cause of Man's Salvation*, are most grossly applied and perverted, as (he saith) by G. Fox's assuming Divine Attributes to himself, p. 26, 27. Which we must needs look upon to be a reiterated aspersion. For where G. F. uses these Words, *I am the Light, him by whom the World was made, and doth enlighten every Man that comes into the World, &c.* This he speaks in the Name of Christ, and not of himself; nor in his own Name, as his following Words plainly shews, viz. *If you love the Light wherewith you are enlightened, you will love Christ, who saith Learn of me.* Now F. B. Dost thou in Conscience believe that G. F. assumes this to himself, or that he himself made the World? Or that he himself enlightens every Man? 'Tis very sad to see thee so hardened and wilfully perverse in thus perverting truth. Thou knowest better, and sins against knowledge in thy Calumnies against us.

F. Bug's Second Charge against the Quakers, *Their Books are Blasphemous, and their practice Idolatrous, &c.*

This we utterly deny as a Calumnious Claim against our Books and practice in general: And therefore the more impossible for

Fr. Bugg rationally to produce the Colour of proof thereof. Wherefore I question him about his pretended Allegations.

1. What Blasphemy or Idolatry was it for any of our Friends to write, *viz. Thou, O North of England, out of thee did the Branch spring, and Star arise, which gives Light to all the Regions round about; in thee the Sun of Righteousness appeared?* &c.

2. How proves *F. Bugg* that *Fox's Disciples* or *Profelives*, (as he scornfully calls them,) *echoed back these Adorations to him*; as calling him the *Branch, the Star, the Sun of Righteousness?* Alluding to *Mic. 5. 2. Numb. 24. 17. Mal. 4. 2. Zech. 3. 8. p. 31.* I challenge *Bugg* to prove where the Quakers gave these Titles to the Person of *George Fox*, or that he assumed them to himself?

Observe. I have viewed over that Epistle of *Edward Burrough's*, to the Camp of the Lord in England, p. 64, 65, 66, 67, where mention is made of the North of England, and where the *Branch* did spring, and the *Star* arise, and the *Sun of Righteousness* appeared, &c. And *G.F.* is not so much as mentioned, or named in all that Epistle; and therefore *Bugg* has most shamefully belied and scandalized the Quakers in this point also; not only in charging them, that the *Quakers Prophets* give Witness to *G. Fox*, instead of *Christ*; that they call him the *Branch, the Star, the Sun of Righteousness*, and put the North of England for the Town of Bethlehem.

(*N. Rom. unm. Epist. to Ber. p. 2.*) But also, because of our Testimony against this Horrid Lye and Abuse; among others, *Bugg* staged Twelve of us, (being Citizens, Tradesmen and others of good Repute,) in his Mock Tryal, wherein he condemns us for *Perjured Persons* to the Pillory, with a form thereof, (in his *N. Rom. Arraign.*) to ridicule and most grossly defame us, both as to our Christian and Civil Reputations affected thereby. Oh, horrible Insolency and Wickedness in thee *F. Bugg*! Thus wilfully to persist in thy Imposing gross Lies and Calumnies upon the World against us!

3. What *Divine Attributes* did *G. F.* assume to himself, in saying *he wrote from the Mouth of the Lord*, or that he was cloathed with *Righteousness*? p. 30.

5. How proves *Bugg*, that to be a true and entire Copy of *John Audland's* Letter to *G. F.* which he cites, p. 30? I deny his Citation; and there's reason to question the truth of it, being also so often varied in Print; and particularly from the Copy sent me by *John Pennyman*; besides the Date of 1665 given it, in the printed Libel, entituled, *Some of the Quakers Principles, &c.* gives more Cause to question the Truth of his Copy: For that Date was Two Years after *John Audland* Died, being in 1663, ('tis great Nonsense to suppose he writ it after he Died,) as appears by their Register of Burials in *Westmorland*. And thou *F. B.* hast owned the said Libel and the

composing of it, in thy *N. Rom. Arr.* p. 10. And didst thou find the Date of 1665, on the said Letters; or didst thou give it, or who did? Answer truly. We may not be imposed upon by thy various uncertain Accounts or Equivocations in this Matter.

5. Which of you have the Original Letter of *J. A's*? And which of you are able to make it appear, by *comparing of Hands* to be his, (as printed by thee) as thou sayest? p. 32. Which of you are so expert in his Hand, that you can make it so appear *ex certa scientia*? I greatly question it. I am sure that *John Audland* believed in, (and confessed) the true Christ of God, according to Scripture, as is fully proved in his Works, cited in my *Just Enquiry*, (p. 26, 27, 28, 29.) and that he esteemed *G. F.* no otherwise than eminently Instrumental in Christ, for his own and others help and comfort.

6. What Blasphemy and Idolatry canst thou prove against *W. P.* and others, in their Book *Judas and Jews*, and in excusing *Josiah Coe's* Letter? Thy proofless Clamours will not do, to bear us down, nor thy hideous out-cry and clamour, that *never greater Blasphemies were spoke by Man, than by Fox*. For shame leave these thy Malicious Calumnies.

7. What Blasphemy and Idolatry provest thou against *John Blackling's* Testimony, that *G. F. was blessed with honour above above many Brethren*? Were there not Elders worthy of double Honour?

Honour? And is not that Honour *Eternal*, which God gives, and is from above, and wherewith he Honours them, that Honour him?

8. And that his *Life Reigns*, (i. e. the Life that *G. F.* partook of,) Is not Christ the Life of all his true Believers and Followers?

9. *His tender Words in the Lords Love were my Soul's Nourishment.*

If these were *J. B's* Words, what Blasphemy or Idolatry was in them; as believing *G. F.* Instrumental in the Lord's Love for his Souls Comfort? Did not *Paul* say, *I have fed thee with Milk, and not with strong Meat?* 1 Cor. 3. 2. And did not Christ's Ministers comfort the otints who were in Trouble, by the Comfort wherewith they themselves were comforted of God? 2 Cor. 1. 4.

Were these Blasphemous or Idolatrous, supposest thou, *F. Bugg?* Oh, how filthy, Loud and Clamorous art thou in thy Charges, and how poor, faint, dull and short in thy proof!

Fr. Bugg's Third Charge against the Quakers.

That they deny the Scriptures, by speaking contemptuously of them, &c. Their Contemptuous Expressions of the Holy Scripture, their contempt of the Holy Scriptures, p. 32, 33.

We utterly deny these his Charges, as both Calumnious, and directly contrary to our Principles. His Allegations are fully answered in these our Three Treatises, viz. *A Charitable Essay; A Just Enquiry, and Innocency Trium-*

phant. But he is so tenacious to his own Opinion, and so Implacable, that he'll receive no Answer; but repeat and impose his old worn, Reproachful Stuff, over and over again.

I am sure our Friends Books alledged by him, if impartially viewed, will clear them in this Case, from either *Denying or Contemning the Holy Scriptures*. And even that of *News coming out of the North*, so often objected, doth in divers parts of it clear the point, both by the numerous Quotations of the Scripture in the Margents, as also where its therein said, *the Lord hath spoken by his former Prophets*; and what? *The Scripture*. And p. 8, *Christ Jesus the Substance of the Prophets*, Ibid. *The Testimonies of the Prophets of God, and Apostles of Christ (against false Prophets and the Works of the World)*, owned, And p. 12, 13. *The Scriptures and Saints Conditions, and the Words spoken by the Prophets, Christ and his Apostles*, owned. And in *Eternal Substantial Truths*, p. 17. *The Life and power of God gave forth the Scriptures*, (he saith.)

Now could this be any Contempt of Holy Scripture? No, but the Contrary. And where do the Quakers say, *that to preach out of them, (i. e. the Holy Scriptures) is Conjuratation?*

There may be true Preaching out of the Holy Scripture by the Spirit of Truth; and there is false Preaching, by perverting the Holy Scriptures.

Bugg's own instance which is against them that *study to raise a Living thing out of the Dead*;

Dead; to raise the Spirit out of the Letter, are Conjurers and Diviners, their teaching not being from the mouth of the Lord, p. 34. This is no proof of his general Charge, that to preach out of the Holy Scriptures, is Conjurati^on. Quer. Where proves he these Words?

His Observation is also false, That the Quakers call the Holy Scriptures Death, Dust, and Serpents Meat. This is a foul perversion, seeing they esteem the Holy Doctrine, to be the Holy Scripture; which he also has granted and agreed to. And our distinguishing between the outward Writing or Books and the Holy Doctrine therein contained, and between the Letter and the Spirit, 2 Cor. 3. 6, 7. This was no Fuggle, nor any Contempt of Holy Scripture, as falsely suggested, p. 33, 36.

The Holy Scriptures mentioned amongst those Writings which I. P. did bring to the Exchange. And to this F. B. saith, Surely they could not burn the Holy Spirit; and that it seems they can call the Bible the Holy Scriptures, for a Wicked Design, p. 36. This is impertinent, as well as Malicious; for the Holy Scriptures therein mentioned, was with the respect to the Doctrine therein contained; for I must tell F. B. that it would shew Contempt to Holy Scripture, even to the Holy Doctrine contained in the Bible, if a Person should voluntarily offer to burn the Bible it self, as the King of Judah did Jeremiah's Roll, Jer. 36. (though he could not burn the Word of the Lord.) But to say the Bible

Bible or Books made up of Paper and Characters will decay and turn to Dust, but the Holy Doctrine, Word and Spirit from whence it came, will endure: This is no Contempt of Holy Scripture, nor yet to the Bible.

His Saying *G.W.* holdly imposes upon the World, that though they call the Scripture Dust, &c. yet they do not call the Holy Scripture so. The first part he falsly imposeth upon me, as he doth on the Quakers. Not only that they call the Holy Scriptures Dust, Death, Serpents Meat, Beastly Ware, &c. which is a horrible Calumny,) but also that they do not believe the Doctrine and Precepts recorded in Scripture, to be either Blessed or Holy, p. 38, 39.

Thus he imposeth his horrid and gross Lies (against us) upon the World; as also that the Quakers never did beg Pardon of God for Christ's sake; and that they do prefer their own Books, Papers and Epistles before the Scriptures, p. 40. These like the rest, are gross Lies, and contrary to our Testimonies extant in Print, as in divers of our Books we positively declare, " That we
 " prefer the Holy Scripture above all other
 " Books extant in the World; and also declare
 " that we are truly thankful to God for pre-
 " serving to us the outward Writings, Scrip-
 " tures, or Books commonly called the Bible,
 as in *Christ's Lambs defend. Epist. to the Reader*, p. 7. *The Christianity of the Quak. Vindic.* In Answer to Dr. Fard, p. 13. And *Charitable Essay*, p. 5. And we do also frequently read the Scrip-
 ture

ture in our Families many of us, more than any other Books or Epistles whatsoever.

To prove the Quakers *Denial and Contempt of the Holy Scripture*; pursuant to this abominable Lye, Bugg faith, viz. *And not knowing a better way to manifest them, I erected a mock Pillory, and tried them, and found them guilty on their own Premises*, p. 33.

The more Insolent, Impudent and Shameless thou *F. Bugg*, and the greater thy Shame and Wickedness: What, convict us of Error by wilful Lies and Forgery, and by notorious Scandal and Defamation? As was thy mock Tryal, and mock Pillory, (as well as thy mock Cage;) from whence we may justly return thy Calumnies against *G. Whitehead*, upon thy self, and can prove them against thy self: viz.

That *F. Bugg* is First, A publick Defamer. Secondly, A wicked Forger. Thirdly, A wilful Lyar. Fourthly, A gross Perverter. Fifthly, A false Glosser. Sixthly, A Deceiver, i. e. of some Silly, Ignorant, Credulous and Enviour Persons, not of any Impartial, Wise or Judicious. Oh horrible! What a *Christian*, a *Convert*, a *Church-man*, an earnest Contender for the Christian Faith, (as thou stiles thy self,) and yet guilty of such horrid Forgery, Scandal and Slander as thy said mock Tryal is made up off. Good Lord deliver us all from such a People, and such a Ministry as own such a sinful Wretch, and Self-Condemed, Malicious Apostate as thou art, for a true Convert.

Thy

Thy Charge of *Denial and Contempt of Holy Scriptures*, on the People called Quakers, is expressly contrary to what thou thy self hast positively declared in Print ; and that even in the Name and Person of the said People ;
 “ pleading for our Testimony to Christ within,
 “ and the Kingdom of Heaven within, *De Christ.*
 “ *Lib. ch. 1. par. 2.* This (sayst thou), we told,
 “ this we proved to the People out of the *Holy*
 “ *Scriptures* ; and that although the *Scriptures*
 “ were good, and a true Declaration of those
 “ things which were most surely believed by
 “ the Apostles, and by us ought to be believed,
 “ yet not the only Rule, but still the Spirit of
 “ God, which was the first Principle, the Founda-
 “ tion Principle, &c. [Thus far *F. Bugg.*] Pray
 note, here’s *F. Bugg*, when a pretended Quaker,
 speaking truth herein, and clearing himself and
 the Quakers from being guilty of the least con-
 tempt of Holy Scripture ; but on the contrary,
 owning the same both as *Holy and True*, and to be
 most surely believed ; whereby both himself and
 the Quakers did then, (*i. e.* in 1682,) own the
Divine Authority of Holy Scripture by his own
 Confession. But *F. Bugg*, since a pretended
 Church-Man, tells the World gross Lies against
 the People called Quakers ; namely, *That they*
deny and condemn the Holy Scripture : *F. Bugg* the
 Quaker spoke truth, but *F. Bugg* the pretended
 Church-Man and Convert, tells Notorious,
 Shameful Lies and Calumnies. *Tis an ill Bird that*
fools

Souls its own Nests; and One such Runagado, is worse than three Turks.

His Reasons to prove that we *do not believe the Doctrine and Precepts recorded in Scripture, to be either blessed or holy*, are as false and impertinent as his Charge, and but a telling Lies, to prove Lies; which therefore I thus oppose.

1. 'Tis false that we cast Reproachful Language, and Contemptuous Expressions upon the Doctrine and Precepts recorded in Scripture.

2. Not reading them in our Meetings for Worship, is no Proof that either we have not the *Spiritual and Living Worship of God* among us; nor any Evidence that we *do not believe the Doctrine and Precepts recorded in Scripture, to be blessed or holy*: Our humbly Worshipping God in Spirit and Truth, is what's required of us by Jesus Christ, and the Holy Scripture, which therefore is Testimony of our Belief that the Doctrine thereof is Holy.

3. 'Tis false again, that we say (without Distinction,) *to Preach out of them is Conjuraton*. I am confident these Words were never spoken by the Quakers thus general and positive, without any other Distinction or Exception about the Preachers and manner of Preaching.

4. These are notoriously false, *that we lay aside as useless the use of the Lord's Prayer, Ten Commandments, &c.* Seeing by the Spirit of Christ, we Pray after that *manner* as he has taught, and practise

practise the Substance of the Commandments, in that Love which is the fulfilling thereof.

5. We are not conscious to our selves of denying the Ordinances of Jesus Christ, either in not believing Sprinkling Infants to be of Divine Institution, or in not practising John's Baptism, which is that of Water, not mentioned in *Go teach all Nations, Baptizing them*, Mat. 28. And *This do in remembrance of me*, (i. e. as oft as ye do it.) But of how long continuance, and till what coming of Christ is the Question? Though we believe this and all other Precepts both of God and Christ were *holy* under their several Dispensations, yet it follows not that we must needs still practise every thidg that *was holy*, or elie be condemned as not believing the Doctrine and Precepts of Scripture to be *holy*. *F. Bugg* will make no good Logick of such Arguments and Consequences; for that were to bring us back to the divers Washings, Baptisms, Tythes, Offerings, Pusslovers and Circumcisions, &c. under the Law; which were *all holy* in their first Institution and Dedication.

6. 'Tis also notoriously false, that we do prefer our own Books, Papers and Epistles before the Scriptures, (i. e. the *holy Scriptures*,) because some of them are occasionally read in some of our Meetings; for both in our Ministry, Books and Epistles, People are often referred to the Holy Scriptures for proof, and excited to read them, and that they may understand, believe and

and live according to the same, by the Assistance of God's Holy Spirit. And therefore we esteem and prefer the Holy Scriptures before our own Writings, contrary to Bugg's false Aspersions upon the Quakers; i. e. *That they make void the holy Scripture by their Traditional Pamphlets.* His gross Lies of this kind are numerous; the Lord rebuke his Lying Spirit, and great Envy.

F. Bugg's Fourth Charge against the Quakers.
They deny the Ordinances of Jesus Christ, as Baptism and the Lord's Supper.

We deny this Charge, as laid down without distinction; and that for our Reason F. B. cites, viz. "As for Baptism and the Lords Supper, Scripturally considered in their several Dispen-
 "sations, in the Figure and Substance, we
 "confess and own. To this F. B. presently
 "answers, *This is false as their Books declare,*
 p. 45. What's false? He considers not he knows
 not what? He answers very inadvertently, are
 not Baptism and the Lord's Supper, Scriptural-
 ly considered, both as in the Figure and in the
 Substance, in the Type, and in the Antitype?
 I never heard any true Convert Christian,
 or real Protestant say, this is false before.
 Was not John's Baptism with Water, a Figure
 of Christ's Baptism with the Spirit? And of
 the Washing of Regeneration? Which was
 greater? And was not the outward Supper,
 Bread and Cup, in Commemoration of Christ's
 Death, a Figure also of his Inward Spiritual
 Supper,

Supper, Eating and Drinking with him in his Kingdom? Who said he, except ye eat my Flesh, and Drink my Blood, ye have no Life in you. Where then is the *falsehood* in our confessing Baptism and the Lord's Supper, in the *Figure* and *Substance*? F. B. quotes E. Burrough's Works, p. 51. *The Bread and Wine is visible and carnal, a figure of a Spiritual thing.* And what then? are they Spiritual, or the Substance which is Christ? That's Popery, which the Martyrs opposed, who esteemed the outward Elements, the Bread and the Cup, *figurative, or a Figure of the Body and Blood of Christ spiritually received by Faith.* What great Error then can F. B. prove against us therein?

He farther cites E. B. in this point, as follows p. 45, viz. "For Christ never since he was sacrificed, brake the Bread, and drank the Cup with his Disciples, p. 581, (instead of 518.) *We do deny, and do say it is no Ordinance of God, neither was it ever commanded of him, or practised by the Saints, but is an Institution of the Whore of Rome, &c.* This F. B. renders E. B. to say of the Bread and the Cup, (being cited in the next antecedent Words, as here.) Oh sad! what a gross Perverter art thou F. B.? This has been often thy fallacious manner of Citation to abuse us; as 'tis plain, that which E. B. here says *we deny, as never commanded of God, nor practised by the Saints, but a Romish Institution was Sprinkling (or Baptizing) Infants; calling it the Baptism into Faith, &c.* as

in *E. B's.* p. § 18, (before quoted,) and not breaking of Bread, and drinking of the Cup as given by Christ unto his Disciples : *E. B.* knew this was some time practised by Believers but not the other ; and it had been more ingenious for *F. B.* to have convicted him of Error about *Sprinkling*, than to mis-represent him. Though I grant *E. B.* in p. § 18, objects against *their manner of breaking Bread, and drinking Wine among the Unconverted and Unregenerate, as not commanded of God, nor practised by his Saints.* But does not call the breaking of Bread, and drinking Wine, a *Pcpish Institution of Rome*, as he does *Sprinkling Infants, and their calling it the Baptism into the Faith.* This point is answered in the *Quakers Vindication*, p. 2. col. 1. But *F. B.* is more expert in mis-representing, traducing and railing, than in rational Argument, or fair Disputation.

As to our Exception against *Sprinkling*, and seeming thereby to allow of *Dipping*, p. 46. we except against the one as unscriptural, and allow of the other as once Scriptural in its proper Dispensation.

F. Bugg's Fifth and Sixth Charge against the Quakers.

That they undervalue the Death and Sufferings of Christ ; and exalt their own Sufferings above the Sufferings of Christ, above the Sufferings of the Apostles, above the Sufferings of the Martyrs, or any Christians since the Days of Christ, &c.

We deny these Charges, as expressly contrary to our Principle, and publick known Testimonies, both highly valuing and exalting the Death and Sufferings of Christ above all other: His charging the Quakers to *exalt* their Sufferings above the Sufferings of Christ, imports as if they so *lifted up, extolled, dignified* or *rendred* their Sufferings *more excellent* than Christ's. This is a most gross Calumny cast upon the People called Quakers, and as expressly contrary to their Intention and Principle. Though F. B. takes advantage at some Words of *E. B's*, which he partially cites, adding the Words [*called Quakers,*] and as unfairly construes against the Quakers in general; as where he saith, *Q. Mary's Days brought not forth a Suffering more cruel*, F. B. leaves out [*in many respects,*] which many respects, he explains to be about trivial Matters, as for not *putting off the Hat*, (*thee or thou to a Person*) and denying the circumstance of *Swearing, and Hundreds suffering on Suspicion, when nothing could be charged against them; and that this was contrary to Magna Charta*. Thus *E. B.* reflects upon the Arbitrary Proceedings of those in power, in 1657. Though I cannot warrant all his comparative Expressions, but grant that the Passage objected against *E. B.* in this place, was not so well worded as intended according to his own Explication: For by *greater and more cruel Suffering*, I cannot think *E. B.* so senseless, as to intend *in all Respects*; as that the People of God in our Age, have under-

gone *greater* and *more cruel* Sufferings than all the Primitive Sufferers, Apostles and Martyrs in the Ten Persecutions; no sure, but in *some respects* wherein they did not suffer then, upon such small Pretences as many did in Cromwel's time, without any such pretext of Law, as the Jews pretended against Christ. However, tho' the Sufferings of the People of God among us, was far short of the Sufferings in the Apostles Days, and in the Ten Persecutions, &c. yet F.B. gives but a mean and partial Account thereof; namely, of *a few Imprisonments, and some small Distresses, &c.*

In the Twenty Five Years he was amongst the Quakers, he might have remembred also, the *cruel Whippings*, and *tedious Imprisonments, close Confinements* many of God's People have met withal here in *Old England*, together with *cruel Beatings, Stockings, Stonings, &c.* As also the sad Accounts from *New England*, of the cruel and barbarous *Whippings, Cutting Ears, Hanging and putting to Death*, divers of our Innocent Friends there: I may not say, this was so cruel as the Sufferings in the Days of the Apostles, and Ten Persecutions, &c. But these being inflicted by Professors of Christianity in *Old and New England*; it seemed more *sinful* and *unjust* in them, than in the Heathens, who pretended to no such Religion and Profession.

One remarkable Passage of *Fr. Bugg's*, pursuant to the Fifth and Sixth Charge against the Quakers, I must needs take some notice of. In his Sheet to the Parliament, he puts a Query, viz.

Whether was greatest, the Sufferings of the Quakers, or the Sufferings of Christ? To which (Bugg saith) G. W. gave no direct Answer, but glossed it over, as his usual way is; for if he had answered, that the Sufferings of the Quakers had been greatest, as their Doctors teach, (a gross Lie by the way,) the People would have been ready to Stone him for Blasphemy. Again, if he had said, the Sufferings of Christ had been the greatest, he had then given the Lye to E. B. So that he was in a great strait like the Pharisees of old their Predecessors. (Thus far Bugg,) p. 47, 48.

Now *F. Bugg*, I pray thee see, and I wish thy Ministers *William Smithies*, and *Isaac Archer*, may see what a notorious wilful Liar thou art, in this very point, in saying, *G. W. gave no direct Answer to thy Question, but was in a great strait.* To evince thy wilful Lie herein, do but review thy own Query, and *G. W.'s* direct Answer therein, in the *Quak. Vindic.* p. 2. viz. To *Bugg's* Query 5. *Whether was the Sufferings of Christ, or the Sufferings of the Quakers greatest?*

1. " In the First place we answer, the Sufferings of Christ, in the nature of them, both
 " inward and outward, in Agony of Soul, and
 " Pains of Body, by that most cruel Death of
 " the

“ the Cross, following that of Scourging and
 “ Crowning with Thorns.

2. “ It was most unjustly and wickedly in-
 “ flicted by his Persecutors the *Jews* and Hea-
 “ then; yet worse in the *Jews*, because they
 “ might have known better, and because they
 “ prosecuted him upon false Witness. And as
 “ Christ’s Sufferings were most Cruel and Un-
 “ just, both as to the Nature thereof, and the
 “ Dignity of him that suffered, so he was a
 “ most acceptable Sacrifice, and sweet smelling
 “ Savour to God, and his Suffering and Sacri-
 “ fice of Universal Advantage and Benefit to
 “ Mankind, in that he died for all Men, and
 “ and gave himself a Ransom for all, that all
 “ might be capable of Redemption and Salva-
 “ tion through him.

Now pray observe, that *G. W.* gave a direct
 Answer to *Bugg’s* Query, viz. *Whether was the*
sufferings of Christ, or the sufferings of the Quakers
greatest? *G. W. &c.* answers directly, viz. 1. The
 Sufferings of Christ in the nature of them, &c.
 2. Christ’s Sufferings most exalted and esteem-
 ed, because of the Dignity of him that suffered.
 And this was obvious to *Bugg’s* Eyes in Print,
 in our said *Vindication*; and therefore then *F. B.*
 must needs be a notorious wilful Liar herein,
 in affirming *G. W.* gave no direct Answer to thy
 Query, but was in a great strait. And as to *E. B.’s*.
 intention and Principle, he exalted Christ’s Suf-
 ferings in their worth, dignity and merit, above
 all other Men’s, as appears by his own and ma-

ny other Friends Testimonies ; highly valuing and exalting the Death and Sufferings of Christ, *E. B's*. Confession of Faith, in his Works, p. 252. " Confesseth Christ Jesus as the High-Priest " of God, the one Offering for Sin, who takes " away Sin, and makes Intercession. And p. 441, " He also confesseth a being washed and cleansed " from all Unrighteousness, by the Blood of " Jesus, by which their Sins are remitted, who " walk and abide in his Light, &c. (He saith.) See also a Book Entituled, *The Son of Perdition Revealed*, Printed 1661, wherein *Ed. Burroughs* and *G. Whitehead* truly thus confess, p. 2, 4. viz. " As Thousands can witness, who have heard " us both preach up, and contend for the free " Grace of God to all Men; and thereby (*i. e.* " by the Grace of God,) Christ tasted Death " for every Man, and died for all Men, and " gave himself a Ransom for all, *Heb.* 2. 9. " *1 Tim.* 2. 6. *2 Cor.* 5. 14. *1 Joh.* 2. 2. And " its also testified, that in many more Books of " ours, the free Grace of God, (*i. e.* in Christ) " to all, and Christ's Dying for all Men, is de- " clared. And p. 4. *ibid.* *Reconciliation* of the " World through Christ's Death, and his be- " ing a Propitiation through Faith in his Blood, " clearly confessed. [Thus far *E. B.* and *G. W.*] Thus highly have they *exalted* Christ's Suffer- ings for the Good of Mankind ; but thus have they not exalted their own, or any other Mens, or Peoples whatever. Therefore the Quakers *exalt* Christ's Sufferings above their own and

all others ; consequently *Bugg* has greatly wrong'd the People called Quakers in this point, in his Fifth and and Sixth false Charge before cited.

Some of *Bugg's* Railery and Lies added under the same Head against the Quakers, viz: *Gross Liars, Grand Impostors, Impudent Cheats. Tea, Ellwood, Richardson, and the most Learned among them. As they have shewed all the Contempt they can to Jesus of Nazareth, (calling him a Vail, a Garment, &c. To the Scriptures, to the Ordinances and Ministers of Jesus of Nazareth ; with great Incharity, p. 56. Here F. B. thou hast lied to purpose, both against the Living and the Dead: I dare say Tho. Ellwood, and the Learned among us (who are yet alive) can testify against thee and the Devil too ; who is the Author of these thy Horrid Lies.*

And that their Preachers never lost Fifty Pounds, p. 57, is another notorious Lie ; for I in particular, with many others, have lost many times more by Informers and Imprisonments.

Whereas *F. B.* is offended at my calling him so often *Bugg*, p. 59, 60, calling me thereupon *Insolent and Imperious George*. What's he then in calling me only *Whitehead*, and another *Fox*, and another *Ellwood*, and another *Richardson* ? Was this Pride, Insolency or Imperiousness in him ? If he says 'twas for Brevities sake, so say I, for I have often mentioned his Name at length ; but sometimes *F. B.* for Brevities sake. He has also told me *he would not go a step to meet*

such a proud imperious Fellow, as in his Letter to me Dated Feb. 16th, 1693. Pray what Humility has F. B. shewn herein? And this is not all, but he thinks thereupon to debase me, by upbraiding me with my former Estate, saying, G. W. came amongst the Quakers, Anno 1652, a poor Boy about Fifteen or Sixteen Years old, travelling on foot, and hath so gathered up his Crumbs, though chiefly at other Mens Tables, that he scorns to call him that fed him and his Friends at his Table by his proper Name, p. 60.

Though he somewhat mistakes as to Time and Age, yet *that Poverty* I am not at all ashamed of; it was for Christ's sake that I was made low and poor: I was no whit behind F. B. in Education, though I was made willing to walk on foot, and deeply to suffer by Imprisonment, (as I did) and many other ways even in my young Years, wherein the Lord was with me, as he still is (I bless his Name.) And as for being *fed at F. B's. Table*, I think 'twas not very often, whether Three or Four Times I remember not; and I suppose it was not without some Invitations by him to his House: Didst not thou F. B. invite me to thy House sometimes? Surely it was not then intended to upbraid me in Print, with *feeding at thy Table*. Thou wast then more a Man, and of more Civility, 'tis pity thy Conversion to the Priests and Levites should so much deprive thee both of *Compassion, Natural Affection* and *Civility*: However since 'tis thy pleasure thus to
upbraid

upbraid me, I offer thee reasonable Satisfaction ; let me have a true Bill how oft I have fed at thy Table, and what each Meal of mine comes to, according to the usual Rates of Ordinaries, and I will pay it, or cause Payment to thee, (God willing.)

To thy Six Charges against *G. Whitehead*.

1. *A Publick Defamer.*

I deny thy Charge, (the Terms thereof considered in the common and evil Sense,) But why *Publick Defamer*? what because he writ that *F. Bugg* was turned *Informer*, a *Self-Condemed Apostate*? &c. The latter is largely proved against thee in my several Answers; as in *Innocency against Envy*. The contentious *Apostate*, &c. *A Charitable Essay*; and *Innocency Triumphant*.

And the first was also proved against thee in *Judgment fixed*, p. 225, 226, 227, 228. By thy informing the Magistrate against us, in thy Book of *Christian Liberty* pretended, accusing us with *Impositions*, a *new stamped Government*, comparing our Yearly Meeting in 1675, to the *Popes Council of Jesuits and crafty Friars*: And thy Testimony then given concerning *Mens and Womens Meetings*, as if it had come from the *Popes Council*, &c. upbraiding our Women's Meetings as an *Idol* of our own erecting, comparing it to the *Papists great Idol*, viz. *The Rood of Grace*, as in thy *De Chris. lib.* 2d Part, p. 32, 36, 46, 47, Printed in 1682.

But

But to be accounted an *Informer*, as afore-
 said, *F. B.* takes very hardly, being in the time
 1682, saying, *he was one of the greatest Sufferers*
by Informers in the whole Country. But *F. B.* wait
 not thou about that time quarrelling with *S.*
Cater, about the Fifteen Pound Fine? And pul-
 ling thy Neck out of the Collar, and winding
 thy self out of Sufferings? And was it such a
 great Crime to render thee an *Informer*, seeing
 what thou then writ against our Yearly Meet-
 ing, tended to render us as obnoxious as the
Papists, like the Popes Council? &c. When 'tis
 well known, that in those Days; many of our
 Friends deeply suffered by Laws made against
 Popish Recusants, in Two Thirds of their Es-
 tates, and 20 *l.* per Month: Didst not thou
 then deserve the Character of a *Malicious Informer*,
mer, in grossly aspersing us as afore said? A
 Wicked Man, is a Wicked Man, a Liar is
 a Liar, a Forger is a Forger, a Persecutor is
 Persecutor, and deserves his Characters.

2. *A Wicked Forger.*

I deny thy Charge again; Wherein a wicked
Forger? What for saying *F. Bugg* affirms in his
Book de Chris. lib. part 2d, p. 83. *That Confor-*
mity is a Monster, &c. And yet in about Two
 Years after, he himself turned about and con-
 formed? In answer to which, thou sayest, I am
 not the Author of one Word of that Page, but
 the whole Passage is a Query of *John Ainsloe's*
 beginning p. 81, and ending p. 87.

But hold F. B. *Jo. Ainsloe's* Query begins not in p. 81, but in p. 82, and recited in p. 83, for p. 81, concludes with these Words, viz. *I shall add one Query which J. A. put forth, to which I never heard that he had any Answer*; and were not these thy Words Francis? And the Words a few Lines before in the same Page, viz. *Error loves obscurity, for its Habitation is Darkness, and Ignorance is the Mother of its Devotion, and Conformity the Monstrous Womb that produced it, &c.* And are not these thy Words Francis? and what difference pray between calling *Conformity the Monstrous Womb*, and *Conformity a Monster*? Is not a *Monstrous Womb* as bad as a *Monster*? What makes a Monster, but something *Monstrous*; and is not that which is *Monstrous*, a *Monster*?

Besides, thou hast appeared so much affected with *Jo. Ainsloe's* Query and Answer, that thou hast taken some care to recite and print the same at large, without shewing any dislike to it, but rather as a matter highly approved by thee: So that thou didst espouse the same; and what he writ therein, thou madest thine by adoption. Thou appearing then of the same judgment, why art now so shy of thy own Adopted Birth or Monster? Why didst not reject it at first, but hugg'd it so long?

3. A *Wilful Liar*.

That I am sure is false; for though I may accidentally mistake in some Circumstances, yet not a *Wilful* (nor witting) *Liar*: Thy pretended

ded proof of this Charge, is the *Conten. Apost.* p. 3. viz. *F. Bugg* and his Company being got into the Meeting before *G. W.* and into the Gallery. I grant there was an accidental Defect or Error happened in that Passage, I not being present to correct the Press, which was afterward corrected, as may be seen in my Sheet, *The Cont. Apost. Recharg'd*, p. 8. in these Words. viz. And Reader observe in the said *Conventions Apostate*, and *his Blow refell'd*, p. 3. l. 11. to read [And he into the Gallery,] the word *he* being omitted, varies from the sense intended, though in some it was corrected after Printed, but in others omitted.

Now pray how will this prove *G. W.* a wilful Liar? *F. Bugg* can take small occasion to asperse. Therefore the defective Account, with the said omission of the Word [*he*] was neither wilfully nor maliciously sent abroad to render thee a Turbulent Disturber, as thou falsely sayest, p. 66. although thou wast very turbulent, and disturbed the whole Meeting, and that wilfully and wickedly, having like a Persecuting Informer, procured a Warrant and a Constable to cause the Persons met, forthwith to appear before some Justice of Peace, to answer an Information against the Meeting, because held under pretence of a Religious Worship, in different form from the Religion established in a place not licensed, &c. which disturbance being contrary to the intent of the Government. And afterwards thou falaciously excused this thy Turbulancy and Persecution, pretending thy

thy getting a Justice's Warrant, was to the intent to get me to own my Book, Judgment fixed, *N. Rom. unm.* p. 53, when the Warrant was expressly grounded upon an Information of a Meeting, under pretence of Religious Worship, &c. And to cause the Persons met, to appear as aforesaid, to answer the Information. Now was not this like an Informer?

4. *A Gross Perverter.*

This I deny as a gross Lie, and his Instance, (though unfairly cited,) Is no proof thereof: 'Tis evident that the Instances Bugg brought in his Sheet, to prove the Quakers Contempt of Government, reviling Christ's Magistrates and Ministers, were out of *E. Burr.* Works, between the Year 1654, and 1659, which was in Cromwel's Days, against his Persecuting Magistrates and Ministers, whom *E. B.* testified against, because of their Persecution, and their Arbitrary Usurp'd Dominion over the Consciences of Men, p. 501. This is no Perversion, but true in fact. It was *E. B.*'s reprehensions against them and their Corruptions, that Bugg did make the Quakers Contempt of Government, as more fully is made out in the *Quakers Vindication*, p. 3. And therefore I did not aggravate the Matter against him, by saying, to do us an ill turn, Bugg has at awares run his own Head against a Wall. What *E. B. G. F.* and *G. R.* writ to *O. C.* and that Government, it was not in favour to their Usurpation over Mens Consciences, Persecution, &c. and the Substance thereof is answered long since,

in a Treatise Entituled, *Christ's Lambs defended from Satan's Rage.*

F. Bugg's Charge of Usurpation against the Quakers, p. 69, shews a great height of Malice and Bitterness, as well as gross Falshood and Perversion, and particularly his first Instance, viz. And that in divers respects: First, In that you Summons the Kings Subjects to meet Annually in London, by way of General Council or Convocation, without any legal Warrant, Writ, or other Legal Authority; and when sat in Council in Devonshire-House, you make Laws, Edicts and Canons for the King's Subjects throughout England to observe, contrary and in direct opposition to those very Laws, Rules, &c. which the King and Parliament make at Westminster.

Pray observe, this seems a heavy Charge, as if *F. B.* had a Mind to hang us all, as well as to Pillory and Cage us. But here are several notorious Falshoods contained in these his Words, in divers respects. As *First*, that we Summon the King's Subjects; this is general, and without Exception too. Query, Who issues out Summons for the King's Subjects? *Secondly*, And what Subjects are they? I know no such Summons, but in Free and Christian Agreement. Our Yearly Meeting, (which has been of many Years standing, is innocently held for Religious Good and Christian Ends, in the Law of God and for Peace, good Order, Amity and Unity in the Churches of Christ; that we may as God's People and Christian Society, be helpful and

ser

Serviceable one to another in our Day. *Thirdly*, And this our Annual Meeting is of no such intent or design to be as a *general Council or Convocation*, to make *Laws, Edicts or Canons* for the *Kings Subjects* throughout England to observe, in direct opposition to those of the *King and Parliament*, (as *F. Bugg* most maliciously suggests.) For First, We know no *Laws, Edicts or Canons* we have to make, either for the *Kings Subjects*, or for our selves, but to be helpful in the truth, and to stir up one another to faithfulness, to that Law and Testimony that God has given and made known to us, who is our Lawgiver.

But what is this *Usurpation* so highly charged against us? and what *Laws and Edicts* do we make? To this he bids us see our Yearly Epistle, May 1675, where (he saith), viz. *In opposition to the Law the King and Parliament made, that you should not meet above Four, &c. You in opposition made a Law, that your People should neither forsake, decline, nor remove their Meeting. This is one remarkable Instance of your juggling with Authority, &c.* [Thus far *F. Bugg.*] To make us look as odious and obnoxious to the Government, as his deadly Malice prompts him. But he is mistaken for all's haste, for what he calls a *Law made by us in opposition to King and Parliament*, we know no such Law made by us, but an Antient, Apostolical and Christian Testimony and Exhortation, which our said Yearly Meeting gave to our Friends; and which had

had been our Care and Practice from the beginning, viz.

‘ That an open Testimony for the Lord
 ‘ should be borne, and a publick Standard for
 ‘ Truth and Righteousness, upheld in the power
 ‘ and Spirit of God, by our open and known
 ‘ Meetings, &c. The said Meeting giving Ad-
 ‘ vice and Judgment, that all Friends gathered
 ‘ in the Name of Jesus, keep up those publick
 ‘ Testimonies, and not to decline, forsake or
 ‘ remove their publick Assemblies.

Whereby ’tis plain, that this Advice was given for no other end, than for their keeping their Publick Assemblies for the Worship of God, in the Name of the Lord Jesus Christ, and very agreeable to the Holy Apostles Exhortation, *not forsaking the Assembling of your selves together, as the manner of some is.*

And how proves F. Bugg, that this Advice was a Law made by our said Meeting, in opposition to the Law made by the King and Parliament? Has he not herein reflected upon the Government, and aspersed the King and Parliament? For where did they make a Law against publick Assemblies, gathered in the Name of Jesus Christ to worship God? How doth he prove the Laws made against *Conventicles, or Seditious Meetings, under pretence of Religious Exercise, &c.* were made against such Assemblies as met in the Name and Power of Christ Jesus, really to worship God in Spirit and Truth? for such were our Assemblies advised to be kept.

Another

Another Instance *Bugg* has against us, *That our Books be spread up and down the Nation, &c.* And what Usurpation or Justling with Authority is this? Why not our Books be spread as well as his? And must he have all the liberty to spread his dirty Defaming Books, and we not have liberty to divulge Answers to them, to remove his Calumnies? That's very unfair and unjust. But he objects *being unlicensed*; that's not true of all our Books. (But who licensed his *New Rome Arraign'd*, with his Mock-Trial, Perjury and Pillory? Neither is it true, that they tend to defame both *Clergy* and *Gentry*, unless to publish the Persecution and Cruelty of some of the Clergy, be to defame both the Clergy and Gentry in general, *That none should pay Tithes or Steeple-House Rates*; are not the Words of our last Yearly Epistle which he also objects against. But that our Christian Testimony borne, and greatly suffered for, be faithfully maintained against *Tithes*, this was not Advice to *all the Kings Subjects*, but to those that have a Testimony from the Lord against the Oppression of Tithes, as being thereof convinced in their own Consciences, that they might be faithful to that Testimony for Christ Jesus, who put an end to the Law and Priesthood that upheld the Tithes.

Which thou *P. M.* had once a Testimony against; but wast unfaithful, and turned thy back thereof. But farther, our Christian Testimony against Tithes, was neither *Law, Edit, or Can-*

non of our own making; but what we received, and were perswaded of in Conscience, By the Light and Testimony of Jesus Christ from the begining.

That none should carry Guns in their Ships: This is perversly and mischievously worded by F. Bagg, and (in its being made a general Prohibition,) varies from the Words of our Yearly Meeting Epistle; and his Inference thereupon, is as Mallicious and Mischievous, where he says, *This shews that you are not content with your own ease, but as far as your Usurpation prevails, you weaken the Government,* p. 70.

Whereas the Caution in our said Epistle was Tender and Christian, relating only to some Ship-Masters, reputed Quakers, who contrary to their former Principle and Practise, (and to the injury of their own Souls and Consciences, by their declension, and placing their Security in that which is altogether Insecure,) carry Guns, &c. so as to endangering their own and others Lives, having let in *Disobedience* and *Unbelief*, 'Twas to such only the Caution was tenderly recommended, that they might be preserved through Faith and Confidence in the Arm and power of God, which is the greatest Security: Now I see not how this could be to weaken the Government, to have them thus preserved. 'Tis more like to be a *weakening*; for any such (by acting contrary to their Principle and Conscience, and letting in Unbelief,) to provoke God to deliver them up to their Enemy to be destroyed.

Let

Let it be observed how tender and careful our said Yearly Meeting was in this very Matter, with respect both to our Christian Testimony, and the outward Government also, in the next following Passage which *F. Bugg*, has unfairly and disingeniously left out; and therefore 'tis here inserted, *viz.*

" Dear Friends, you very well know our Christian Principle and Profession in this Matter, both with respect to *God* and *Cesar*, that because we are Subjects of *Christ's* Kingdom; which is not of this World, we cannot fight; *Job. 18. 36*, Yet being Subjects of *Cesar's* Kingdom, we pay our Taxes, Tribute, &c. according to the Example of *Christ* and his Holy Apostles relating to *Christ's* Kingdom and *Cesars*, wherein we are careful not to offend, *Mat. 17. 27.* and *22. 20.* *Rom. 13. 6, 7.* Being also very glad, and much satisfied in the many Testimonies given at this Meeting; of our Friends Innocency, quiet and peaceable Behaviour, under the outward Government, as becomes our Christian Principle and Profession.

Now the Reader may observe; that our Yearly Meetings Epistles, are not Laws and Edicts Imposed, but Epistles tenderly recommended to the Consciences and Christian care of our Friends only.

3. *A False Glosser.*

This also I deny, being not conscious to my self of false glossing in this, or any other instance he brings against me, viz. "The Quaker. *Vind. &c.* p. 2. *F. Bugg* accuses somebody for "objecting against paying of Tithes under the "New Covenant, because abrogated by Christ, &c. On which he makes his Observation, That by this they, (i. e. the Quakers,) have condemned the Martyrs and all Christians, &c. As in his Sheet, p. 4. Whereupon he adds, viz. Observe this false Glosser; I did not say they condemn either Martyr or others, who did refuse Payment of Tithes; I neither said so, nor will my Words carry any such imputation. Rep. Neither did I charge thee with so saying; but that the Quakers have Condemned the Martyrs and all Christians, &c. (which makes no distinction.) And by what have they condemned them, but by denying to pay Tithes under the New Covenant, because abrogated by Christ. And how could this be a Condemning the Martyrs and all Christians in thy Sense, unless thou concludest they were all for the payment of Tithes? The Case is plain, I did not accuse thee with saying the Quakers condemned the Martyrs or others who refused the Payment of Tithes, but because in opposition to *Tho. Ellwoods* saying, ["They who pay Tithes uphold a Legal Ceremony, abrogated by Christ; and thereby deny Christ to be come in the Flesh."] Thou observed, by this they have condemned the Martyrs and all Christians

yea, Kings, Parliament and People, who pay or take Tithes. Now doth not this plainly imply, that the Martyrs and all Christians were for the payment of Tithes, if the Quakers Testimony against Tithes be a condemning the Martyrs and all Christians? I confess I cannot find how I am a false Glosser herein; and against thee F. B. in this I fairly objected, "That thy Observation was too general upon the Martyrs, for that both John Wickliff, William Swincherby, Walter Brute, William Thorpe, the Bohemians, with others mentioned in the Book of Martyrs and others, did bear Testimony against the Corruptions of the Popish Clergy, and against Tithes, and compelled Maintenance. (And were not these Martyrs Christians?) This was made a Principle Article against them by the Papists, as more largely appears in the first Volumn of Martyrs, in the Reigns of Richard the Second, Henry the Fourth, and Henry the Fifth.

6. *A Deceiver of the People.*

This I also sincerely deny, as a false and malicious Aspersions cast upon me and my publick Ministry; it cannot reasonably be supposed to relate to any Personal or Circumstantial Mistakes, (if I have been under any,) but to my publick Ministry about Matters of Faith and Salvation; concerning which, I know him in whom I have believed, whose Divine Power and Goodness, hath preserved me from my

Youth upward in sincerity towards him, whom I have sought from my Childhood ; and therefore am not Conscious to my self of being a *Deceiver of the People* ; for my Eye is to the power and Spirit of *Jesus Christ*, who hath made known unto me the word of Reconciliation, and made me a Living Witness of him, to the Consciences of many Thousands, (I bless God.)

And *F. B's* Instance, *Judgment Fix'd Introd.* if the Lord did not lay a necessity upon me, I should chuse to be mute, but the Lord has laid a necessity upon me, &c. And (what Proof is this of his Charge ? Where's the Assumption ?) I say so still, he has laid a necessity upon me to preach the Gospel, and to testify against Deceit, Envy and Wickedness ; and I perceive not how this instance alledged against me, can be any colour of Proof for his Charge. Can my saying, *The Lord has laid a necessity upon me, either to Preach or Write*, prove that I am a Deceiver of the People ? Doth not *F. B.* himself pretend the *Assistance of God's Holy Spirit*, in his *New Rom. Arraign.* p. 46. But I am sure a contrary Spirit has assisted him, blown and puff'd him up in his reproaching, stigmatizing, calumniating and rendring odious and obnoxious a Peaceable People, and their Christian Testimony ; for which the Righteous Judge of all will deal with him ; and as for his Personal Petractions, Defamations, and bitter Calumnies

nies cast upon me; as *Wicked Forger, Wilful
 Liar, Gross Perverter, Publick Defamer, &c.* I
 return them (as before) upon himself, and
 rejoyce in the Lord my God over them: And
 that I am counted worthy to suffer for his sake:
 For I esteem the Reproaches of Christ, greater
 Riches than the Glory of *Egypt*.

A FEW
Gentle Reflections
UPON

*T. C's Animadversions, (said to be
Tho. Crisp's,) on George White-
head's Book, Entituled [Innocency
Triumphant.]*

TO evince the said *T. C's* Inadvertency and Impertinency, as well as Malice and outrage, in his unjustly Charging *G. W.* and his Abettors (or Friends) as proved guilty of Contempt of the Person of our Blessed Saviour, the Holy Scriptures and Governours, Perverseness and Falseness, justly chargeable on himself in his undertaking to be an Advocate for *Fr. Bugg* in his Bad Cause, and gross Calumnies.

I finding a great part of *T. C's* Allegations against us to be taken upon trust from *F. Bugg's* Authority, and before answered in the foregoing

going Treatise, and divers other Answers; I shall need say the less to many of his impertinent and senseless Quarrels; but take notice chiefly of such as concern me, and those Friends whom he calls my Abettors, pursuant to his false Charge of *being guilty of Contempt of the Person of our blessed Saviour (i. e. Jesus Christ,) and the Holy Scriptures, &c.* which Charge (in good Conscience towards God, and his dear Son Jesus Christ our Mediator,) I sincerely deny and testify against in the first place, as contrary to my Christian Principle and Profession from my Youth upward. Howbeit to prove G. W's *Partiality and Contempt of our Lord Jesus, T. C.* saith, *viz. I shall here insert some of G. K's Doctrines, which G. W's. Creatures opposed, and about which chiefly the Difference was, which G. W. represents but as [pretended Fundamentals;] for says he, about some fundamental Doctrines, as is pretended by one Party.* This is falsely represented and perverted against G. W. in the first Part, who did not represent those of G. K's Doctrines mentioned, but as *pretended Fundamentals*; although T. C. has this falsehood *pretended Fundamentals* divers times over in his Introduction. Whereas my Words are *[as is pretended by one Party,] relative to divers Accounts lately published in Print, of some late Divisions and Disputes about several Fundamental Doctrines of the Christian Faith, (as is pretended by one Party,) which therefore, (at least some whereof,) I grant to be such, and do not call them pretended Fundamentals* :

mentals : But that the late Division is pretended to be about them, according as my Words are clear, in our small Treatise referred to, viz. *The Christian Doctrine and Society of the People called Quakers*, p. 1. one of which Fundamental Doctrines which he says *G. W.* represents but as pretended *Fundamentals*, is, *That Christ is in Heaven in his glorified Nature of Man, Body and Soul, God and Man both* ; Introduction, p. 2.

And where have I contemned or opposed this Doctrine ? How Inadvertent and unjust art thou *T. C.* in this ? Do not I plainly declare in the same Treatise, p. 3, " *That as Man Christ died* " *for our Sins, rose again, and was received* " *into Glory.* And p. 5. *That Christ's Body* " *that was Crucified, by the power of God* " *was raised from the Dead ; and that the* " *same Christ that was Crucified, ascended into* " *Heaven and Glory, and that his Flesh saw no* " *Corruption ; it did not Corrupt* But yet " *doubtless his Body was Changed into a more* " *Glorious and Heavenly Condition than it was* " *in when subject to divers Sufferings on Earth.* &c. Where's now the Contempt of his Person ? Mayst thou not be ashamed of thy false abusive Charge ?

From my Saying the *same Christ that was therein* (i. e. in the Body, or Flesh,) *Crucified*, thou falsely inferrest, *So then he that was nailed to the Cross and pierced, was not Christ*, p. 24. Here thou quarrellest with the Apostles Doctrine and Language, 1 *Pet.* 3. 18. *Being put to Death in*
the

the Flesh : And *ch. 4. 1. Christ hath suffered for us in the Flesh.* 1 *John 4. 2. Jesus Christ is come in the Flesh* : And 2 *John 7. And many Deceivers are entred into the World, who confesse not that Jesus Christ is come in the Flesh.* Mark here, Christ suffered in the Flesh, and Jesus Christ come in the Flesh. Was this to deny him that suffered on the Cross to be Christ? or to Contemn his Person? No sure. How sillily hast thou deduced many Inferences of this kind against us, as if thou wert minded to be Litigious?

Again, Thy inferring, *That he who was nailed to the Cross, was not Christ, but a Body, a Vail, a Garment, of an Earthly, Perishing Nature,* p. 24. Here again thou pervertest and abusest us: Where did we ever say, that he who so suffered, was not Christ, but a Body, a Vail? &c. Seeing it was *Christ* that suffered in the Flesh, and his Flesh was called the *Vail*, Heb. 10. What Contempt to Christ, or Denial of him was such Saying? And where did ever any of us say, that his Body that was nailed to the Cross, was of a *Perishing Nature*, seeing his Flesh saw no Corruption?

But thy great Offence is about *Is. Pennington's* Words, viz. *We can never call the Bodily Garment Christ,* p. 26, &c. And what then? is this *Undervaluing* or *Contempt* to Jesus Christ? 25. Is it not as true literally, as a Man's Garment cannot be the Man himself that wears it? And may it not be as true figuratively, as *Christ's*

Christ's Flesh was the Vail? And that without any Contempt to him, his Body or Flesh called the Vail: Unless thou canst prove the Holy Apostle a Contemner thereof; who used the same Expression. *He (i. e. Christ) hath Consecrated for us a new and living way, through the Vail, (i. e. his Flesh,) Heb. 10. 20.* That Christ Jesus, as to his entire Existence or Being, doth not consist only of the Body or Flesh that was Crucified. Thou grants as much, not only in thy Confessing his Person as joyned to the Godhead, Power, Life and Soul, was called Jesus and the Saviour, p. 24. But also his being the Anointed, as well as the Anointing, p. 5. For Christ was before Abraham, and David in Spirit called him Lord, and he was that Spiritual Rock that all Israel drank of. *As for excusing Errors and Contempt of our Lord Jesus, (falsly charged on J. P.) and being liable to be charged therewith, p. 26.* I am not conscious to my self of so doing, by discovering his Intention, and by his own Explications of the Words objected against him, viz. As either that the Vail which was Christ's Flesh, or that the Bodily Garment we can never call the entire Christ, as intimated by his own Words, chiefly and in the first place Christ; as in one of his Questions.

'Tis strange that thou should shew so much Envy against that Innocent Man, as to charge him with Contempt of our Lord Jesus, who did more sincerely believe and confess him, both in Principle, Doctrine, Charity and Innocent Conversation, (than thou hast done) whose sincere

Con-

Confession is also evinced against thy Brother F. Bugg. By the Term *Vail*, we neither *undervalue Jesus*, nor *set his Light above himself*, as is implied against us, p. 25. For though every degree of Divine Light in us, is of and from Christ Jesus, yet 'tis greater and more as in him, in whom the fulness is, as is more fully cleared in our said Treatise of our *Christian Doctrine*.

Concerning the Flesh of Christ being a *Vail*, Heb. 10. thou grants *was in respect to Man*, and so the Figure may be proper, as intended by the Apostle: If so then that *Vail* was not the entire Christ, though the Name was given both to his Soul and Body in Scripture, jointly and severally; if by the Term *Flesh*, be commonly understood the Person of our Lord Jesus, where then dost thou prove that the Quakers condemn the *Flesh of Christ*, considered either Spiritually or Litterally? And though the Person of Christ I find but once mentioned in Scripture, 2 Cor. 2. 10. from *in conspectu Christi* in facie Christi vel Conspectu Christi, in the Face or Sight of Christ. Yet understanding thy meaning, I am not minded to quarrel with thee about Words and Terms.

To thy excusing F. Bugg's false Charge of Denying Jesus of Nazareth, against us, p. 25, I do not perceive thou canst make any good work of it upon his Instances, where he makes our confessing Christ in us, and witnessing him nearer us than at Jerusalem, (as J. Naylor did, &c.) to be a denying of Jesus of Nazareth, or confessing that

that Divine Principle (i. e. the Word, the Life or Spirit of Christ,) to be the Foundation Principle of Living Faith and Knowledge of Christ in his Spiritual Appearance in us. I cannot see how this can be a Denying of Jesus of Nazareth, any more than the Apostles preaching the *Word of Faith nigh in the Heart*, &c. However thou art chargeable with Bugg's Charge in this Case, which results in this Proposition, from his own pretended Proofs, viz. *That to affirm Christ in us, or that which may be known of God in us, or Christ nearer us than Jerusalem, is to deny Jesus of Nazareth.* Wilt thou stand to this Proposition yea or nay, according to Bugg's said Charge and Allegation, in his Sheet? If thou wilt, then it will appear who is in the Spirit of *Anti-christ*, G. W. or T. C. For whether is it not as much *Anti-christian* to deny Christ come in the Spirit, as to deny Christ come in the Flesh?

And for F. Bugg's Paper to the Parliament, thou grantest so far as it may affect any *uninstructed* Quakers, its not well, and thou believest he would not damage such, p. 14. But how know'st thou that? When contrarywise like a Busy-Body in other Mens Matters, and malicious Incendiary, he did interpose with his inveterate Lying Pamphlet to the Parliament, against the People called Quakers, even at that very interim when our Friends were petitioning the House of Commons for ease to the said People in general in case of Oaths. Did not this tend

to obstruct favour being shewn them? With what Face or Conscience then canst thou say thou believest he would not damage Conscientious Quakers, when his *Invective Pamphlet* made no such distinction? For shame Man do not excuse such an act of apparent Malice and Intrusion, who also hast farther shewn how thou dost second *Bugg* in Malice and Partiality, where thou sayest Liberty of Conscience is but just and reasonable, for such as are truly conscientious, if they could be truly distinguished from *G. W.* and some such as he is; the opportunity *G. W.* may have thereby, may be of ill consequence, p. 14. Here thou shewest thy self offended at *G. W.* and his Friends; having that Liberty, 'tis well thy Horns are short, that thou hast not power to ruin us, but only to bark, and hiss and grin at us Thy Mercy would be that of the Wicked, which is Cruelty; and thou shews what thou wouldst be at, namely, to incense the Government against us, about our Marriages, and Non-payment of Tithes; the latter thou art greatly concerned about, for Liberty of Conscience (forsooth) for the free Payment of them, p. 15, 16, 17, 18, 19, 20. And who hinders such whose Consciences are for the Payment of them, if there be any such? But we know very few beside thy self, who alledge Conscience, but rather Compulsion for the Payment thereof. And therefore thy Charge of *Rebellions on the Laws and Government of the Nation, and of Pride and Insolence, and deserves the*

Cognizance of the Ministers of State, p. 15. and
Contempt of the Government, with much more of
 such inveterate Consequences against us about
 this case of Tithes; all this is a great indication
 of Malice, Rage and Revenge more than Rea-
 son on thy part; the Civil Government need not
 thee to be an Informer and Instigator therein
 against us, either because of our Non-payment
 of Tithes, or our Christian Testimony against
 them: For it is a Case well known to the Go-
 vernment ever since we were a People, and
 many of them have so much Charity, (much
 more than thou hast) as to believe it is not in
 Contempt to the Government of the Nation
 that we refuse the payment of Tithes, but
 purely because it is a matter of Conscience to
 us, as our deep Sufferings, Imprisonments and
 Sequestrations on that account do demonstrate
 whether our Consciences be rightly informed
 or no in that Case. However 'tis an easier mat-
 ter for T. C. to rail against us, and to villify
 those among us that have given Testimony and
 Reasons in print, against the Impositions of
 Tithes in this Gospel Day, than for him to an-
 swer or refute such Reasons. Why does he not
 answer T. Ellwood? Besides his supposing that
 there were Tithes before the Law, so he knows
 not but that there may be, after that Law is
 abolished, p. 19. And who then abolished that
 Law that gave the Priesthood a right to take
 them? if that Law was of Divine Authority
 it must be abolished by Divine Authority, and

rona
 tive
 y ca

one had that Divine Authority to abolish them
 at Christ. Therefore it was by his Divine
 Authority they were abolished. Now then it
 remains for *T.C.* either to prove that Christ re-
 newed the Law for Tithes, or bring an Antho-
 rity above his, to enforce Tithes again. But
 presume he'll not attempt either of these.
 Consequently he does not refute what he cites
 against *Tho. Ellwood*, by his I know not but
 there may be, *viz.* "That they who pay
 Tithes, uphold a Legal Ceremony, abrogated
 by Christ, and thereby deny Christ to be
 come in the Flesh, which is a mark of Anti-
 Christ. And whereas *T. C.* takes up *F.*
egg's Objection, *viz.* *That by this they have con-*
demned the Martyrs, and all Christendom, Kings,
Parliament and People, who pay or take Tithes; a-
 gainst which, I objected his Observation is too
 general upon the Martyrs, because some did
 bear Testimony against Tythes. Hereupon
T.C. chargeth me with being very fallacious,
 and with wilful wickedness; and why so?
 (this is very harsh;) for saith he, *F. B.* doth
 not say *all* without Exception. But I say his
 words are general, that by this the Quakers
 have condemned the Martyrs, as well as all
 Christendom: And by what? but by their Te-
 stimony against the Payment of Tythes, be-
 cause 'tis in opposition to Christ's Abrogation.
 But the Words *who pay or take Tythes*, cannot be
 relative to any of the Deceased Martyrs, for
 they can neither pay nor take Tythes; and

therefore if *Bugg* had intended an Exception of the Martyrs who denied Tithes, he should have said, they have condemned such, or so many of the Martyrs who have paid or taken Tithes: for *who do pay or take Tythes*, is in *presenti*, and not in *preterito*: The matter seriously considered I must needs look upon *T. C.* to be very uncharitable, in deeming me *fallacious and wilfully wicked* in this point. And I am still confirmed in my Consequence upon *F. Bugg's* Observation against our seeking Favour of the Government, *viz.* So that if we cannot for Conscience sake pay Tithes, he will not allow us any favour of the Government, if his uncharitable Attempts may take effect: And I do not find how *T. C.* can invalid this Consequence, by his excusing *Bugg*, in saying, *viz.* And not as *G. W.* would wickedly insinuate, that if any cannot for Conscience sake pay Tithes, they should have no favour. No, no, such uncharitable Sentences are too near of kin to *G. W.'s* own Spirit, to come from *F. B.* far be it from him, I dare say it never entered into his Heart, such an uncharitable Thought.

P. 17.

To the first part, I answer the very Instance which *F. Bugg* and *T. C.* chiefly strike at in this point, *viz.* [That Tythes are abrogated by Christ, and the Payment thereof a Denial of his coming in the Flesh and Antichristian,] is a plain Indication, that 'tis for Conscience sake they (that are truly Conscientious and Faithful among us) cannot pay them. And their be-

lieving

eving they are abrogated by Christ, and therefore
 the Payment thereof, a denying him to be come in
 the Flesh, is the greater Argument of their be-
 ing conscientious to Christ, in refusing to pay
 them. And therefore *F. B's* opposing our ha-
 ving Favour, tended to affect the most Tender
 and Conscientious among us. And 'tis not *T. C's.*
No, No, that will excuse him, nor his daring to
 by such an Uncharitable Thought never entred
B's Heart, that will clear either of them from
 uncharitableness towards us in this point. What
 profound, heart-seeing Judge hast thou *T. C.*
 made thy self herein? it seems very high Pre-
 sumption in thee, (but without Probation,) thus
 to acquit thy Brother *Bugg's* Malicious Heart,
 when from Uncharitable Thoughts, as if he
 were arrived to a very high pitch of Perfection
 above thy self, who confessest thy self to be an
 imperfect, Fallible Sinner in thy *Introd.* And no
 doubt as Fallible in this thy profound Judgment
 and Vindication on thy Brother *Bugg's* Heart.
 And as Fallible and Sinful thou appearest in
 condemning *G. W.* as wicked, and his Spirit as
 not the Spirit of Christ; and that upon a strange,
 presumptuous, and severe Execration upon thy
 self, in thy following Words, viz. p. 5, 6.
I have here taken notice of but some of G. W's.
wickedness, that by the Fruit he brings forth, you
may be capable of judging into what Root he is graft-
ed; and I am so well satisfied that his Spirit is not
the Spirit of Christ, nor he (as he falsely pretends) a
constant Servant of Christ, that I do now in coolness
and

and not in heat of Passion, give him and his wicked Abettors that advantage to improve their Interest and Power therewith, (i. e. the Spirit of Christ, against me, that I may end my Days in Infamy, as an Example to others, if his Spirit be that of Christ. [Thus far thou T. C].

Now observe here what a fearful Execration or Curse thou hast conditionally denounced against thy self, (resembling that Oath, God do to me and much more, if, &c. 1 Sam. 20. 12. 2 Sam. 3. 35. 1 King. 2. 23.) and appears no less than an Oath of Cursing in a high degree, and all to prove *G. W. wicked, not led by the Spirit of Christ, nor a Servant of Christ.* For if he be so, or his Spirit be of Christ, then with the Spirit of Christ we may improve our Interest and power against thee; and so, *as that thou may end thy Days in Infamy, as an Example, &c.* This be no proof at all against *G. W.'s* Spirit, but rather the contrary, that thou art not a Christian Spirit, nor led by the Spirit of Christ, (who forbids all Swearing, and commends Blessing and not Cursing) by thy voluntary bringing thy self under such an Oath of Execration; yet the Spirit of Christ in us, is not willing thou shouldst perish or dye under thy own Curse, though thou hast reason to see it's coming upon thee for thy great Envy, and horrible Presumption herein, if thou dost not Repent.

SOME BRIEF
REMARKS
ON
T. C's. BOOK.

MY testifying against *F. B's*. Seditious Treatment, as thereby endeavouring to incense the Government, and stir up the Mobb against us, as being *New Rome, Perjured Persons, &c.* proves not me *Seditious*, as is falsely reported, p. 9. unless *T. C.* will own himself *Seditious*, by the same Argument, because he accuses *G. W.* to be guilty thereof. Yet *Buggs. signed Pillory, T. C.* confesseth *was not well don'e* but then to extenuate and excuse *F. B's* Crime, he places it on *high Provocations, &c.* telling *Oppression may cause a Wise Man to err*, p. 9. it seems he would not have him rendred *Mad*, no' his Mock-Trial and Pillory, was no small

G

piece

piece of Madness. But is this all the Judgment and Condemnation T. C. has to give against Bugg's cruel Mocking and gross Forgery, in his *Mock Trial*, and *Condemnation* of Honest Men to *Perjury* and *Pillory*; which appeared no other than the Tragedy of a furious Incendiary and Persecutor, and a work of Envy, Outrage and Scandal to incense the Government and Mobb against us? which to testifie against, could not be seditious on our parts, as T. C. mistakes in his Inference.

On that Saying *his Flesh is a Figure*, p. 26. The form of a Servant, and Fashion of a Man, are of the same Import, *χρήματι*, Phil. 2, 6, 7, and not in Contempt given to Christ. Where is the Term *Flesh*, understood the *Person* of our Lord Jesus? Where did F. P. say that the *Flesh* or *Body* of Christ, is of an *Earthly*, *Perishing* Nature, p. 27. though ours be?

I am not convicted of *acquitting the Guilty*, or *accusing the Innocent*, by inverting F. B's. Argument against F. Pennington upon himself, viz. Now if he (to wit Christ) took ours, and ours be a perishing nature, ergo his was perishing, or it was not ours, (Quoth F. B.) This being spoken of Christ's *Flesh* and *Blood*, 'tis apparent F. B. run into the same Error he falsely accuses F. P. with; for he cannot deny that Christ took upon him the *Flesh* and *Blood* of our Nature, Heb. 2. 14. And that ours is *perishing*. Whence F. B's. Consequence is, Ergo, his was perishing, it was not ours, thereby he plainly has inferred

Christ

Christ's Flesh and Blood to be of a perishing Nature. And thou T. C. canst not wind him out of this Snare, nor make F. Bugg innocent or found in his Logick; against which I excepted, viz. I deny his *Ergo*, though our Flesh be perishing as in us, it was not perishing when assumed by him: See *Innocency Triumph.* p. 23, 24.

How far the Name of Christ belongs to every Member, but chiefly to *him* the Head, is fully demonstrated in my *Charitable Essay*, p. 4, which thou dost not Answer but quarrellest impertinently.

Where dost thou prove that the *Person* of our Lord *Jesus* consists of *Flesh*, if none do oppose his *Flesh or Body*, to his *Soul or Life*? (as thou sayest,) p. 26.

Thou wouldst know where the *Flesh* of Christ as distinguished from his *Life and Soul*, is called Christ in *Scripture*, p. 28.

Ans. 'Twas Christ that died, but how? as to his *Flesh*, not as to his *Soul or Spirit*.

That the *Person Jesus* of Nazareth, we do not exclude or deny to be Christ, p. 29. If by *Person*, thou meanest both *Soul and Body*, he being a Compleat Saviour.

Qu. 1. Can the *Bodily Garment* taken literally, be called Christ?

2. And is a *Person* made up of *Body or Flesh* only?

3. What is a *Person* truly and properly? Though [*Him*] is sometimes given to the

Body, yet more properly to the Son of God, for whom it was prepared, or to the *entire Christ*.

I know no *Contemptuous Speeches*, or Expressions of our Lord *Jesus*, or Scriptures *excused*, p. 12. 29. consequently much less owned by me. And though I have evinced *J. P's* meaning, on his Words reflected on about the *Body or Flesh of Christ*; it follows not that I thereby *make his Expressions mine*, seeing I note them as *his*. I may see cause otherwise to word the Matter, and yet our Intentions be the same. We have not the same Expressions and Utterance in all Cases, and yet may aim at, and mean the same thing, but never to *Contemn* our Blessed Lord and Saviour *Jesus Christ*, (or the *Holy Scriptures* which testify of him,) in any respect, far be it from us so to do. Therefore *T.C.* has grossly wronged and misrepresented us in these Matters, with many more Perversions, Lies and Scandals in his Pamphlet than are here recited, for which I wish his Repentance before he dies.

What *Terms were intended to G. Fox*, where his Name is not mentioned? p. 29.

Dost thou ground this on *Bugg's Charge*, that our Prophets called him the *Branch*, the *Star*, the *Sun of Righteousness*, and put the *North of England*, for the *Town of Bethlehem*; as in his *New Rom. unmsk. Epist. to Ber.* and p. 81? If thou dost, thou hast espoused a shameful Lye, before detested, that our *Testimony against T*; thes
should

should be *maintained*, p. 30. is not a Law of our own making, but of Christ's; and we are Conscientious in observing of it.

And to thy Question about (*our boldness for our Testimony in that Case,*) *what may be expected from them,*—(that is the Quakers), *when they have power?* p, 18.

Ans. It may be expected that they will take away the Burthen of Tythes and forced Maintenance, and leave all People free to maintain their own Ministers. And what hurt should we do therein pray?

Qu. Who termed *G. F.* the great Apostle of Jesus Christ? p. 30. He was a great Apostle of Jesus Christ, *Ergo*, not Jesus Christ, as some have aspersed us with Blasphemy. But he might be eminently instrumental in Jesus Christ, as a great Apostle of his, endued with Life, Strength and Power from above, for the Converting, and strengthening many in the Faith: And believe *J. C.* and *J. A.* meant no other of *G. F.* but as eminently *Instrumental* in Christ Jesus, whose Servant, Minister and Apostle he was.

Thou fallaciously beggest the Question, in believing those High Titles of the *Branch* and the *Star*, were intended to *G. F.* p. 30, as thy other *Bugg* most fallly accused and defamed (for Denying,) with *Perjury* and *Pillory*: is a bad Cause thou abettelt, for which the Judge of all, will judge thee.

If

If true Prayer and Praise to God by the Spirit of Christ in his Saints be as Living Sacrifices, how much more his Spirit and Life, which is the Cause of such Sacrifice?

Where provest thou that those Names and Terms thou sayest were *Hellish* and *Hell-ferch* were given by any of us to true Ministers, or to Christ's Ministers, as thy Brother *Bugg* has accused us?

That *F. B.* gives us all the ill Names he can p. 32. I meant all the worst of Names, as *No Rome, Impostors, Cowards, Sophisters, a pack of False Witnesses, and Perjured Persons*, and that *Simon Magus* never exceeded these *Impostors*. Were not these as ill Names as he could give us? What worse than *Impostors* and *Sorcerers* as *Simon Magus* was? canst thou give us worse?

P. 35, 36. The Expressions charged as *Contempt of Christ's Person*, set in opposition to Scripture Testimonies, seem to be taken on trust from *Fr. Bugg*; and out of his *No Rome, &c.* and mostly answered; and I doubt not but our Friends Books out of which they were taken, would clear themselves, if impartially examined.

T. C's. Charge against the Quakers amounts to this, that they undervalue and condemn the Body of Christ, the Flesh of Christ, the Person of Christ, and the Man Christ Jesus himself, p. 37. &c. Which is all a gross and great Slander against us, for which Jesus Christ will judge thee *T. C.*

As also a Notorious Falshood that *G.W.* in his little Book, p. 5. *doth implicitly deny Christ's Bodily Ascension*, p. 37. I have confess'd the contrary, viz. That the same Christ that was Crucified, visibly ascended, &c,

Thou finally appealest to the Impartial Reader, whether there be not great cause for Suspicion, that we contemn and slight our ever Blessed Lord Jesus, the Scriptures and Governours? And what Cause or Ground of Suspicion hast thou for these Calumnies? with *Bugg's* Exceptions, and thy impertinent Quarrels, which we accept not for any Probations. Now thy great Charge is turned to Suspicion: For shame give over such Envenomous, Trifling, Doting, Shatter-headed, Confused Work? And do not thus mispend thy little remaining precious time with such abusive peevish Quarrels and Calumnies against the innocent and Peaceful, who owes thee no ill-will. What Injury have either *G. Fox*, *Isaac Pennington*, *George Whitehead*, or *Tho. Ellwood* done thee, that thou art so peevish and bitter against them?

THE END